

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN January 1917 there was formed a Society for Old Testament Study which included in its membership many Hebrew scholars of international repute. During the twenty-one years of its existence it has done much useful work, and now to celebrate its coming of age it has issued a volume of essays on the Old Testament, entitled *Record and Revelation* (Milford; 10s. 6d. net), under the editorship of Principal H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A., D.D.

The volume covers the whole field of Old Testament study and gives an up-to-date account of the work done in each department—Literature and History, Religion and Theology, Archæology, Language, and Exegesis. There are about twenty essays, each by an acknowledged authority, and it would not be possible to find within the same compass a more comprehensive and reliable survey of the whole field. The work deserves the heartiest commendation. It is well planned, and despite the diversity of authorship it makes a coherent whole.

The last two essays stand somewhat apart from the rest and are of quite peculiar interest. The former deals with the Old Testament and Judaism. It was written by the well-known Jewish scholar, Dr. C. G. Montefiore, whose death in July of this year is a great loss to Hebrew scholarship. He points out that until modern times Judaism has been hampered in its development by having regarded the Old Testament as the perfect word of God, as homogeneous and on one supreme level of moral

and religious excellence. 'Nevertheless it is no less a fact that, impelled or induced by its genius or by the divine will, or by good fortune (however the fact be interpreted), Judaism has largely fastened on the great things in the Old Testament, and neglected, or explained away, the cheap and crude and undesirable things.' Again, 'for them God was what He is depicted as being in the best passages and in the highest teachings of the Old Testament; the others were ignored.'

Dr. Montefiore remarks that this selective reading of the Old Testament is just what Christians also practice, even though as Fundamentalists they may theoretically maintain the plenary inspiration of the whole. He gives, however, no indication of where the Jew finds the moral and religious standard by which he judges and selects. For the Christian, of course, this standard is given in Christ and the gospel, and it would be an interesting subject of inquiry how far modern Judaism has been unconsciously influenced in its selective reading of the Old Testament by the Christian standard.

The last essay in the volume, written by Principal W. F. Lofthouse, is on the Old Testament and Christianity. It is a singularly suggestive and helpful bit of work. The writer has no sympathy with those who in many quarters discount or deny the value of the Old Testament, who would cast it aside as 'Hebrew old clothes,' outworn and useless

because superseded by the Gospel. It is his conviction that 'the New Testament is properly intelligible only in the light of the Old, that the Old Testament is only fully intelligible in the light of the New; and also that, so understood, the Old Testament contains the record of a revelation of divine will and purpose, without which life cannot be rightly lived on this earth, or peace, justice, and goodwill among men attained.'

The religion of every part of the Old Testament is the religion of promise. 'With their feet firmly set on a track that leads back to certain indubitable events, and with keen attention to all that is happening around them, the best of the Hebrews fix their eyes on what lies in front, and even, by a daring and heroic venture, on what is hidden on the other side of the horizon.' What is to come they can only dimly see, and how it will come they can only guess, but their faith is never daunted, nor do hope and courage fail. The writers of the New Testament had all this in view, for they had been brought up on the Old Testament and were steeped in its language and thought. Yet now a striking difference of tone emerges. 'If the Old Testament looks from the present to the future, the New looks from the future to the past, or rather, as the grammarian would say, to the perfect tense. The promise is fulfilled; the grace of God has been manifested; the deliverer has appeared; we have seen Him, heard Him, known Him.' But the end is not yet, there is more to come. The Christian looks for the consummation; Jesus Himself waits till all His enemies are put under His feet.

At first reading, the words of Jesus suggest something wholly new. If the vocabulary is that of the Old Testament, the spirit is fresh. Jesus Himself recognizes this when He contrasts His words with what was said by them of old time. Yet He knew Himself to be in line with the prophets. As He said, He came not to destroy but to fulfil. 'Are Law and Gospel opposed? Did Jesus remove the first to establish the second? Properly speaking, there is no opposition between the two. Paul might allow himself sometimes to speak of the

Law as if it were merely a catalogue of burdensome and senseless duties. But he was too good a Jew not to know that it was more than this. It was God's instruction to men, revealing to them how they could enjoy His favour. It was more. It was a promise, though a conditional one. "If you do this, you shall live and be blessed." But through sin the promise was continually deferred. The heart was sick. Hence the Gospel; a second promise, and this time not conditional.'

Between the thought and language of the Old Testament and the New there is thus a profound harmony of which Christian theology must take full account. The theologian neglects the Old Testament at his peril. It is not too much to say that many strange divergencies in Christian theology might have been avoided 'if the theologians had taken the trouble to read their New Testament texts with eyes that had grown familiar with what they might have seen in the Old.'

Take, for example, the doctrine of God. How variously it has been presented. God has been held to be the Supreme Being whose existence, but not His grace, can be demonstrated by reason. Or He has been conceived as the stern Judge, the outraged potentate, or by contrast, the loving Father too kind and lenient ever to punish. Now it is not to be denied that such conceptions are to be found in the Old Testament, but each of them is only part of the picture. 'If we put the picture together, we have a jealous will, intense and passionate, who, lord of the whole world which His providential care has created, uses it and every event which takes place within it to draw men, once created in His image, to Himself. Could any portrayal of God help to keep the theologian nearer to the New Testament presentation than this?'

Or take the doctrine of sin. It is variously spoken of as an infringement of law, or as a weakness of the will, or an inherited taint, a relic of the beast, or as a physical poison springing from the unclean desires of sex. Its effect upon the will is hotly disputed. Man, no matter how grave and prolonged his sin, is still unconditionally free, or, on

the contrary, his will is totally enslaved. 'The Old Testament writers are not interested in the discussion of these subjects; they leave it for later Jewish and Christian theologians. But they are aware that sin is a condition, partly no doubt of the body, certainly of the mind and will; a disease; a contamination. But even when the whole heart is sick God will call for repentance; and God's will cannot be for the impossible. Once man responds, in God's appointed way, God is ready with His grace. There is more in the New Testament than this; but there is more here than in much of our theology.'

So in regard to the Atonement the number of theories advanced is notorious. Of these, of course, the writers of the Old Testament are wholly ignorant. But the Old Testament has a doctrine of personal reconciliation, and if some of our theories of the Atonement had been tested by it their inadequacy would have been exposed. In the Old Testament 'the devil, in the theologian's sense, has no influence on God's dealings with men; nor does God demand so much suffering as a penalty for so much sin; He is neither desirous of the death of a sinner, nor is He moved by anything except the return of the sinner from his own wickedness, that he may live. But is not blood demanded that He may be appeased? Is not vicarious sacrifice at the centre of Israel's thought of man's approach to God? This view we have already seen reason to doubt. But even were it true, the animal that is sacrificed for man's sin is in no sense being *punished*, nor are its sufferings dwelt upon. Its blood is regarded as shed in order that by that pure offering the offerer may be purified and enabled to come into the presence of God. Even if the Servant Songs had never been composed, the Old Testament might have protected us from the misconceptions of a thousand years of Christian speculation.'

Hence we can see how profoundly true is Augustine's dictum that the Old Testament is *patent* in the New, and that the New Testament is *latent* in the Old. In the Old Testament veil after veil that covers the face of truth is withdrawn, and men are bidden look for the perfect unveiling.

That perfect unveiling is given in the New Testament in the Person of Him who is the Word incarnate. Is this a baseless assumption, then our hope is vain, our belief in a divine revelation is but a dream. The Old and New Testaments stand or fall together. 'If the Christian's faith in the Son of God is an error or a delusion, the Old Testament will fall with it. For its record will be no more than a record of old unhappy, far-off things; and its expectation will be as the vanishing glamour of a mirage. But if God has indeed been declared by the only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father (and to whom else should we go? has He not the words of eternal life?), then the Old Testament also is a revelation, and a revelation, it is not too much to say, of permanent and priceless worth.'

Yet another book from Professor C. H. DODD's busy pen! This time it is *History and the Gospel* (Nisbet; 6s. net), being five Lectures delivered in March, 1938, at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Union Theological Seminary, New York; and the Andover-Newton Seminary. They reveal once more the author's power of clear and suggestive exposition.

In nineteenth-century criticism the aim was by analysis of the Gospels and assessment of them as historical documents to reach the historical Jesus. But in modern criticism the Gospels are recognized as emphatically religious documents, and the tendency is to decry the significance of mere facts of history, supposing they could be ascertained. It is part of the revolt against 'historicism' and the renewed interest in the dogmatic aspect of the Gospels, as conveying a divine revelation.

While this shift of emphasis is all to the good, we must still ask the historical question. Christianity cannot be indifferent to historical fact. The Gospels are religious documents, but their witness to faith is bound up with their witness to certain events that happened in history. It therefore remains a question of acute interest to the Christian theologian

whether their witness to historical events is in fact true.

But what is implied in the description of Christianity as an historical religion? The mystical type of religion concerns itself with man's inner life, rejecting the things which are temporal and aspiring to the eternal. For it, history is at best irrelevant and at worst a hindrance to the soul's union with God. Nature-religion, on the other hand, looks upon the world of time and sense as a medium of divinity, being a response to the 'numinous' or awe-inspiring quality of natural phenomena, whether regular or exceptional. But for it also history as such is irrelevant.

While Christianity does not reject the idea of the revelation of God in mystical experience or in the sphere of Nature, but takes up both modes of revelation into its own scheme, it finds in history the primary field of divine revelation. 'It is from the vantage point of a historical revelation that we can look both inwards upon the life of the spirit and outwards upon the world of Nature and discern in both the vestiges of the Creator.'

When it is said that for Christianity the eternal God is revealed in history, it does not mean that any striking episode in history may be regarded as the self-revealing act of God, such as the re-emergence of the German nation under Adolf Hitler; nor that the truth about God can be discovered by a synthesis of the observed facts of history, as in the 'organic' or the 'cyclic' theory put forward by the philosopher of history.

History, as the field of the self-revealing activity of God, does not consist of bare events, nor of any casual event, but of a particular series of events to which a unique intensity of meaning belongs. 'The particular, even the unique, is a category entirely appropriate to the understanding of history; and since one particular event exceeds another in significance, there may well be an event which is uniquely significant, and this event may give a unique character to the whole series to which it belongs.'

It is the claim of Christianity that a unique significance attaches to the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, as revealing the purpose of God in history, and that this supreme event gives a unique character to the whole series of events recorded in the Bible from the call of Abraham to the emergence of the Christian Church. The purpose is never conceived to be completely revealed in the history of Israel, but it is conceived as to be revealed in the great consummation, the Day of the Lord. In Christianity the coming of Jesus Christ, His death and resurrection, are represented as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, as eschatological events in the full sense.

Thus the story of the Gospels is a narrative of events whose meaning is eschatological, that is, 'events in which is to be discerned the mighty act of the transcendent God which brings history to its fulfilment.' Accordingly, the question of the historicity of the Gospels is one which cannot be set aside. The Gospels are both historical and religious documents.

Professor Cecil John CADOUX, M.A., D.D., has written a book—*The Case for Evangelical Modernism: A Study of the Relation between Christian Faith and Traditional Theology* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net)—which will no doubt arouse considerable discussion. We are aware of many sporadic utterances from the Modernist side on certain points of traditional belief. But in this book we have, not only a criticism of 'Orthodoxy,' but a definite attempt to relate the Modernist position to the Christian facts and to rationalize it, in short, to give it a doctrinal form.

The term 'Modernist' is a very elastic one. It would include extreme left-wing Unitarians, and might even embrace thinkers on the other wing like Dr. A. J. Rawlinson. Dr. CADOUX qualifies the word by 'Evangelical,' and this implies (what indeed his book confirms) that his Modernism accepts fully the results of modern criticism and at the same time adheres faithfully to the gospel of

the grace of God in Jesus Christ. 'Christians are essentially those for whom God in Christ has wrought great things whereof they are glad, those who through Christ have found God, have tasted His love, and experienced His saving, cleansing, and uplifting power.'

In seeking for truth, however, we must proceed as the scientist does—there is no difference between science and religion in this respect. And when we do so we find certain principles involved. One is that the basis of operations is the world of objective reality, and for the Christian that means God. The human counterpart to this objective reality is the faith, intelligence, and conscience of man. But the seeker after God also (like the student of science) needs the guidance of experienced and therefore authoritative teachers, whom he finds in the Bible and elsewhere. The decision as to which teachers he will trust, however, is the act of his own private judgment. No teacher, however much trusted, is ever rightly regarded as infallible. His authority is provisional.

And finally, if we raise the question: How is the seeker to *know* what is true, how are we to be safeguarded against error? the answer lies, not in any established body of doctrine, however venerable, but in the records and experiences of God's dealings with us. 'If, as we believe, God really exists and works through His Holy Spirit in the minds and consciences of men, then, so long as man remains a truth-loving animal, our orthodoxy [in the sense of ascertained truth] is secure, whatever errors may from time to time attend our efforts to reach it.'

These principles, summarized in the last two paragraphs, may be taken to be the essential content of modernism, evangelical or not. And in the light of them Dr. CADOUX examines the conclusions and methods of what he calls Traditionalism (we may pass over his criticisms of the left-wing and of Barthianism, both of which he designates 'blind alleys,' as they are on familiar lines). The traditional Christology, as embodied in the Chalcedonian formula, he rejects mainly on two grounds. One

is that it locates the Divinity of Jesus in the metaphysical composition of His Person rather than in the spiritual and moral quality of His character. The other is that this metaphysical construction is in flagrant contradiction with the recorded facts of our Saviour's life. Dr. CADOUX admits that the traditional Christology has safeguarded a precious truth, that God was truly and uniquely in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. But that does not justify its other errors. And indeed does not justify the position, to which all Modernism objects, that authoritative truth lies in a closed body of doctrine rather than in the experience of the believer.

We are waiting patiently for Dr. CADOUX's own reconstruction. But he keeps us waiting a little longer while he clears out of his way certain 'unhistorical elements.' The first step in a reconstruction is to dispose of these. They are no fewer than nine. And only a bare list of them can be given here. They are as follows: the Virgin Birth, the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, that Jesus was omniscient, that He performed any of the 'Nature miracles,' that Jesus was conscious of pre-existence, that He claimed to have authority to forgive sins, that He claimed to be sinless, that the discourses in the Fourth Gospel are from His lips (or most of them), and, finally, that His body left the tomb. That is a comprehensive, and a very serious, list of negatives. It does not seem to leave much ground for doctrinal reconstruction. But, in spite of that, no reader of this book will fail to be impressed by the brave attempt in it to preserve all that is precious in our Christian faith.

Dr. CADOUX wishes to be true to the data given us in Scripture and experience. And he sees clearly that the difficulty in the way of a working theory is our need of somehow unifying the humanity which Jesus shares with us and the uniqueness wherein He differs from us. 'All men, we often say—at least all good men—are in some sense divine; but Jesus is divine in a unique sense.' The traditional Christology failed because, though it admirably safeguarded the unique character

of His Divinity, it virtually denied His real humanity.

Dr. CADOUX believes that, in endeavouring to solve the problem, we have to take seriously what he boldly calls the divinity of man. There is, he says, a striking similarity between the assertion that God is in some sense *in* men and the great Pauline affirmation that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself.' And Conservatives and Modernists meet to-day on common ground in affirming that the goodness and self-sacrifice of Jesus are, in some real and mysterious sense, the goodness and self-sacrifice of God Himself. 'Why, therefore, should we not, tentatively at least, affirm that "God's presence and His very Self"—the Presence and Self manifested with unique clarity and fulness in the overwhelming goodness of Jesus—is after the same fashion though with less clarity and fulness manifested in those in whom Jesus Himself has called forth a longing to follow Him?'

Dr. CADOUX is fond of Paul's phrase 'the first-born among many brethren,' and it seems to sum up his Christology. Dr. CADOUX sees clearly that his position falls far short of the precision attempted in the traditional creeds. It is at least exposed to other criticisms, as he admits, and especially two; that it is pantheistic, and that it is unitarian. Both these criticisms he rejects. He quotes with approval Dr. Wheeler Robinson's words, that 'for the modern man earnestly seeking the confirmation of his faith in Jesus and not blind to all the difficulties of the day . . . the only way is to face Jesus in His humanity and resolutely to seek God in and through the human values of the personality of Jesus. . . . Perhaps the most helpful thought may be to ask ourselves the question: "What other expression

of the Godhead could there be than through such a humanity as this?"'

And as to Unitarianism, Dr. CADOUX by no means denies the doctrine of the Trinity. He has his difficulties about it, like all of us, but he accepts it. 'The Trinitarian assertion of the existence from all eternity of "God the Son" who became incarnate in the human Jesus I accept as a method of affirming that the forth-going divine life manifestly present in Him for the salvation of us men was as divine and eternal as that of the Father Himself.' And Dr. CADOUX earnestly asserts that his immanental Christology does not ignore or omit that vital Christian belief for which more traditionalist language is often asserted to be the only safeguard.

We do not propose to criticise the conclusions of this book. That is not in the scope of these notes. But in the minds of many readers who sympathize with the writer's aim and admire his courageous attempt to preserve what is essential in real Christianity, there will remain an uneasy feeling, due to two things. One is the suspicion that with the removal of the 'unhistorical elements' referred to, the basis of the Divinity of Christ is seriously compromised. And the other is the query that persists as to whether Dr. CADOUX's position really does safeguard the uniqueness of Christ. It should, however, be added that the author earnestly contends that in this Evangelical Modernism there is a gospel for sinful and suffering humanity, and that the message of the redeeming grace of God in Christ can be as efficiently conveyed to men in Evangelical Modernism as in traditional ways. That is his last word, and it is, of course, the all-important issue.

After Fifty Years.

III. Aspects of Sacrifice in the Old Testament.

By PROFESSOR E. O. JAMES, D.LITT., Ph.D., F.S.A., UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS.

FIFTY years ago, when the spirit of historical inquiry was beginning to pervade the study of religion, the scientific theories put forth to explain the origin and significance of sacrifice were mainly influenced by the prevailing belief that the institution arose as an attempt to appease angry gods and spirits by propitiatory offerings on the principle of a life for a life. This widespread notion derived some support from a superficial study of the Hebrew ritual where the blood rite played a prominent part and the idea of placation seemed to be a determining motive (cf. Gn 8²¹, 1 S 26¹⁹, 2 S 24²⁵). Moreover, it is true that in primitive states of culture offerings are not infrequently made at times of stress and calamity to ward off real or imaginary evils, and sometimes these are substitutionary in character. But further investigation has shown that while ideas of this nature are contained within the institution, taken as a whole the primary purpose is to maintain a right relationship between a human community and the supernatural powers upon which it depends for its continuance and well-being. If this involves an element of fear, and a desire to 'cover' guilt or drive away evil, it is mainly directed towards the securing of a renewal of strength and a fresh outpouring of vitality.

Since the blood derives its efficacy in ritual from the belief that it constitutes the animating principle of a living organism, it is the most potent agent in establishing a vital alliance between those who are united in a blood-bond. This was recognized by Robertson Smith at the end of the last century when he suggested that sacrifice arose in an act of communion effected by the worshippers partaking of the flesh and blood of a theanthropic animal at once god and kinsman.¹ The weakness of his hypothesis lay in the emphasis he placed on Totemism as the universal source of the institution, whereas it now appears that it is only a secondary and sporadic mode of primitive social organization among certain hunting peoples, and if it ever occurred among the Semites it must have been at a period so remote from the time when Hebrew tradition was systematized that it had long ceased to be inoperative. Nevertheless, when and where it

occurred it expressed a rudimentary form of the blood-covenant which in more advanced cultures found expression in the institution of sacrifice. Thus, totemic ceremonies held to make the sacred ally increase and multiply usually conclude with a sacramental meal on the flesh of the species in order to strengthen the bond of union between it and the human group which depends on it for its identity.

Sacrifice, however, belongs essentially to a later stage in social and religious development when the community was organized on a theocratic basis with certain individuals, notably the divine king, set apart to control the powers of Nature in the interests of mankind. Since the life of the king was mysteriously bound up with the prosperity of the country and the processes of fertility, according as he was virile or lacking in vitality the flocks and herds thrived or languished, the fields yielded an abundant or meagre harvest, and the community was healthy or sickly.² To guard against the disastrous consequences that must inevitably follow were the ruler to succumb to illness, senility, and natural death, he was killed while still at the height of his vigour in order that his sacred life might be transmitted to his successor. Various devices have been adopted throughout the ages to secure the transmission, and there is a passage in the Egyptian Pyramid Texts which suggests that the slain king was actually eaten by his successor to imbibe his life.³ At an early period, however, it would seem that substitutes were often provided for the royal victim, and while at first these may have been one of the sons of the monarch, or at least some member of his family, who therefore shared in a measure his divinity, soon the supreme penalty was paid by commoners, especially strangers and prisoners of war.

Although human sacrifice has never been more than a phase in the institution, it unquestionably was widely adopted at the dawn of civilization in the Ancient East, and in other agricultural communities, as, for example, among the Aztecs in Mexico. Moreover, while the killing of the divine

² Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. III., 'Dying God,' 24, 27; Pt. VII., 'Balder the Beautiful,' vol. i. 1 f.

³ *Pyramid Texts*, 393-414.

¹ *Religion of the Semites*^a (London, 1927), 224 ff., 245.

king was doubtless largely responsible for the practice, the presence of bodies of children in the foundations of buildings in Palestine and elsewhere reveals that human offerings were made to strengthen the walls of houses and cities (cf. Jos 6²⁶, I K 16³⁴) as well as to renew vegetation by revivifying the gods and their earthly incarnations and representatives.

Prior to the Josiah reformation in 621 B.C. (or, as some Old Testament scholars would think, long after this time), children were passed through the fire to Molech (*i.e.* the king) in the valley of Hinnom (2 K 23¹⁰), while the story of the execution of the vow of Jephthah (Jg 11^{30ff.}) leaves no doubt as to the prevalence of the rite in Hebrew tradition. If the account of the offering of Isaac is told in the form of an eighth-century Prophetic Midrash, there is nothing to suggest that the sacrifice was regarded as repugnant to Yahweh (Gn 22¹⁻¹³). On the contrary, it would seem that originally the injunction in the Book of the Covenant, 'the firstborn of thy sons shalt thou give unto me' (Ex 22²⁹), was literally enforced.

The Passover ritual is full of obscurities, but as Frazer says: 'the one thing that looms clear through the haze of this weird tradition is the memory of a great massacre of firstborn.'¹ There can be little doubt that the annual commemoration of that terrible night at the vernal equinox, when 'the Destroyer' was abroad on his bloody campaign, points back to a time when human victims were offered, probably to renew the vigour of the king in order to revivify the forces of Nature at the time of the Spring Festival. The Feast of Unleavened Bread (*Maṣṣôth*) in the month of Nisan or Abib coincided with the Babylonian New Year Festival (*Akitu*) celebrated at Esagila, when in the temple of Marduk at Babylon the slaying of Tiamat was commemorated in a ritual drama re-enacting the struggle between the forces of good and evil to secure the well-being of the crops and the community during the forthcoming year. To bring life and light out of decay and darkness the Creation Epic was recited, and the king renewed his power by seizing the hands of the image of Marduk and receiving absolution from the priests, having first delivered up his regalia as an act of abdication. By these means he saved his life, retained his throne, and revivified the processes of Nature at the turn of the year.

That the Hebrew Passover represents a Palestinian development of the same Spring Festival is suggested by the season at which it was held, the

ritual employed during the observance and the meanings attached to it in the Priestly tradition, when after a long lapse of time the feast was revived (2 K 23^{21ff.}). Thus, it began on the 10th of Nisan and continued till the 21st, as in the case of the Babylonian *Akitu*, and reached its climax on the night of the 14th when the moon was full. At the fateful vernal equinox every precaution had to be taken to keep at bay the Destroyer. No one might leave the house, and the door posts and lintel were made secure by smearing upon them the blood of the lamb or kid killed as the Paschal victim. The flesh was eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, and every trace of the feast had to be removed before the morning. For the next seven days no leaven was permitted to be eaten.

This was the form of rite assumed in the post-exilic community, when the *Pesach* (offering of the firstborn) and the *Maṣṣôth* (Unleavened Bread) were combined, and the whole observance was interpreted in terms of an ætiological myth centring in the story of the Exodus regarded as the beginning of a new division of time.² In the Book of the Covenant the coincidence of the Feast of Unleavened Bread with the Spring Festival and a rather obscure reference to the offering of the firstborn are mentioned, but no details of the ritual are given. Doubtless in the original Paschal rite the victim was eaten raw as otherwise the prohibition in the later account in Ex 12^{8,9} would be meaningless. In this case the purpose probably was to imbibe the inherent vitality, as in the Arabic camel sacrifice in the fifth century A.D. described by Nilus. Like the Thracio-Phrygian worshippers of Zagreus who consumed the raw flesh of bulls and calves, the Arabs appear to have drunk the warm blood of the camel victim before 'hacking off pieces of the quivering flesh and devouring them raw with such wild haste that in the short interval between the rise of the day star which marked the hour for the service to begin, and the disappearance of its rays before the rising sun, the entire camel, body and bones, skin, blood and entrails, is wholly devoured.'³ In this way the life of the sacred victim, which originally was itself divine, was absorbed by all who shared in the ceremony, and the common bond between them re-established and confirmed.

The sprinkling of the blood on the lintel and doorposts in all probability was a later addition to the Passover narrative, derived perhaps from the

² Jewish chronology was divided into two parts: (1) from the Creation to the Exodus, and (2) from the Exodus onwards.

³ *Religion of the Semites*, 338.

¹ *Golden Bough*, Pt. III., 176.

practice of smearing houses with blood to repel demons, but if it was an accretion, it was in accordance with accepted custom to set up an efficacious barrier to prevent the Destroyer entering houses during his nocturnal ravages at this fateful season. Nevertheless, if the blood of the victim was poured out at the altar prior to the feast it could hardly have been smeared on the entrances to the houses, and at first perhaps the eating of the sacred flesh was regarded as sufficient protection against hostile attacks. By partaking of a sacramental meal, union with the victorious beneficent powers was established, whereby a renewal of strength was obtained to combat the forces of evil, just as the Athenians at the time of the annual Anthesteria chewed buckthorn and anointed their doors with pitch to drive away the ghosts let loose at the Pithoigia.¹ The bitter herbs in the Passover rite were probably originally apotropaic agents comparable to the Greek buckthorn, but among the Hebrews it was the sacrificial victim which was endowed with the plenitude of divine life. At first, apparently, this was the firstborn of man (Ex 22²⁹), but when an animal was substituted it had to fulfil certain carefully prescribed conditions in order that it might be efficacious as a vitalizing agent.

In the composite form of the festival the Paschal meal became a sacrificial feast on an animal victim to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt, but while in the process of reinterpreting the Spring Festival into an aetiological myth the rite lost a good deal of its earlier significance, the tradition of the slaying of the firstborn survived together with the vegetation elements in the ritual. The Passover remained, in fact, the initial event in the seasonal festivals of the agricultural year, whether or not originally the *Pesach* was a nomadic moon-festival. Professor Hooke is probably correct in regarding the three seasonal observances mentioned in the Book of the Covenant as separated parts of one Annual Festival directed primarily to the same end.² Thus, the *Maṣṣôth*, celebrated at the beginning of barley harvest (Ex 24¹⁸), was connected with the offering of the firstfruits symbolized by the waving of the sheaf of barley (*omer*) before Yahweh on Nisan 16th (Lv 23¹¹); a practice with a considerable history behind it, performed to promote the fertility of the crops during the forthcoming season. Seven weeks later, at the end of barley harvest, and the beginning of wheat harvest, two 'wave loaves' baked with leaven (Lv 23¹⁷) were offered at the

Feast of Weeks or Pentecost (*Shābu'oth*). Finally, at 'the turn of the year,' an autumnal Harvest Festival was held at the Ingathering (subsequently known as Tabernacles or *Sukhôth*), just as in Mesopotamia the spring and autumn were both occasions of New Year celebrations. It was then that the victory of Yahweh as the Lord of Creation was proclaimed with appropriate sacrifices and rejoicings (Lv 23^{24ff.}).

According to the Priestly Code (Lv 23²⁷, 16^{29ff.}), on the tenth day of the seventh month (*Tishri*) the Annual Day of Expiation or Atonement was held as a solemn act of penitence and ritual purification of the priests, the sanctuary, the holy vessels, and all 'the people of the assembly.' This was effected by the high priest offering a bullock as a sin-offering, and taking two goats over which lots were cast. The one selected for Yahweh was killed and its blood, like that of the bullock, was sprinkled on the 'mercy seat' in the holy place and on the horns of the altar. After all these cathartic rites had been duly performed, the other goat on which the lot 'for Azazel' fell was taken, and the high priest, laying both his hands upon its head, confessed over it 'all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions, even all their sins.' It was then led to the wilderness laden with the evil of the nation to carry its burden to the sin-receiver (*i.e.* to Azazel). The identification of this being is difficult to determine, but whether he was a satyr, a goat-demon (one of the *se'irim*), haunting waste places, or an *elohim*, his function was the absorption of evil. The goat was merely the carrier, like the living bird in the purification of the leper (Lv 14⁷), and it was not until much later that he was regarded as a sacrificial victim thrown over a precipice as an act of atonement.²

The sins of the nation having been removed by this primitive mechanical process of purification, the high-priest laid aside his official vestments like the king at the Babylonian *Akitu* Festival, and washed himself in the holy place. He then revested and came forth to complete the expiation by offering burnt offerings. Similarly, the men who led away the scapegoat and carried without the camp the carcasses of the bullock and goat employed as the sacrificial victims, were required to wash their cloths and bathe in water before being readmitted to society. Five days later the Feast of Tabernacles began on the 15th of Tishri, when all the fruits of the land had been gathered. The proceedings opened and closed with a Sabbath, or rest day, the intervening week being spent in booths made of

¹ J. Harrison, *Themis*² (Camb., 1927), 289.

² *The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual* (Oxford, 1938), 46 ff.

³ *Yoma*, 6.

greenery resembling the Babylonian *gigunu* of cedar erected in the temple of Marduk, according to Mr. Sidney Smith, as a nuptial chamber for the sacred marriage of the king and queen.¹ This rite with which the Annual Festival normally concluded, typified the union of heaven and earth upon which the fruitfulness of the year depended, as it was supposed. Therefore, it formed a fitting conclusion to the series of feasts and ritual observances in the agricultural calendrical cycle.²

Taken collectively these Hebrew agricultural festivals conformed to the general pattern of the institution of sacrifice in the ancient world which originally centred in the things which were done to and by the king to secure the prosperity of the community.³ It is for this reason in all probability that the prophets of the seventh and eighth centuries opposed the ritual order and the monarchy, and appealed to the desert tradition as the true and only legitimate source of the religion of Israel. Thus, Amos, who had been brought up in the pastoral culture of Tekoa in isolation from agricultural society, appears to have denied the divine origin of sacrifice, and refused to admit that it was part of the original nomadic culture of the nation. 'Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?' (Am 5²⁵). Again, his successor Hosea declared, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings' (Hos 6⁶). Isaiah in the southern kingdom of Judah condemned even the sacrificial worship of the Temple at Jerusalem. 'To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats' (Is 1¹¹).

In the strenuous days before the fall of the capital, Jeremiah fell back on an intense individualism in which sacrifice had no place. Each man must suffer for his own sins and each man must be saved by his own righteousness. 'I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them . . . saying, Harken unto my voice, and I will be your

God, and ye shall be my people: and walk ye in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you' (Jer 7^{22f.}). The new covenant when the desolation of the nation shall have regenerated the apostate people, will be purely ethical written 'in their hearts' (31^{33f.}). Similarly, Ezekiel, the priest-prophet of the Exile, was as insistent as his predecessors on the need of a change of heart and the maintenance of spiritual religion, when the Temple should be restored and worship re-established in the beauty of holiness (Ezk 36²⁶, 20⁴⁰⁻⁴⁴, 37^{26ff.}). But he saw a vision of a cultus fulfilling these requirements when the Exile had done its work of reformation.

This indeed did become an accomplished fact when the sacrificial system was organized in Judaism since while the ancient ritual pattern survived non-moral holiness no longer was thought to suffice. Thus, in the Levitical Day of Atonement, though the expiation was primitive in its setting, being a mechanical removal of guilt by cathartic rites and a scapegoat, something more was implied. In later Judaism the Rabbinic penitential theory maintained that expiation of the more 'grievous' offences committed with a 'high-hand' was only effected when the ritual was performed with sincerity of heart and true repentance.⁴ 'For transgressions that are between a man and his fellow the Day of Atonement effects atonement only if he has appeased his fellow.'⁵ The ethical teaching of Ezekiel and the Deutero-Isaiah gave a new significance to monotheism which inevitably reacted on the work of Ezra and his successors in the restoration of the religious organization of the post-exilic community. In referring back the ritual order to Moses and the desert, it was brought into conjunction with the more spiritual tradition of the prophetic movement, and though the antecedents were to be found in the vegetation kingship cultus, the rites were given a new evaluation.

The ancient symbolism of the blood as the life remained (Lv 17¹¹, cf. 3². 7. 13, 7¹. 2. 7, 8^{14f.}, 9²⁻⁴. 8¹². 16. 18), but instead of being outpoured in the 'sin-offering' (*hättöth*) to revivify and augment the power of the god, or drive forth the forces of evil, it became a compensation for injury, and a sign of inward cleansing by true repentance: 'the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit' (Ps 51^{16f.}). The peace-offering (*shelem*), which in pre-exilic times was a sacred meal (1 S 11¹⁵, 2 S 6^{17f.}), developed into the votive offering (*neder*), the free-will offering (*nedabah*), and the thank-offering (*Todah*), or sacrifice of atoning efficacy offered in a thankful spirit

¹ *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1928, pp. 849 ff.

² The Feast of Tabernacles and the Day of Atonement are not mentioned in the pre-exilic literature, and even Nehemiah is silent about the Levitical Day of Expiation. These very ancient rituals therefore seem to belong essentially to Judaism where they were re-interpreted in terms of the desert tradition of Israel.

³ Cf. S. H. Hooke, *Myth and Ritual* (Oxford, 1933); *The Origins of Early Semitic Ritual* (Oxford, 1938); E. O. James, *The Origins of Sacrifice* (London, 1933).

⁴ *Yoma*, viii. 9.

⁵ *Ibid.* ix.

(Lv 3), so that the ceremonial meal acquired a eucharistic meaning independent of propitiation. The three main ideas of the placation, the ritual removal of guilt, and of substitution, derived from the New Year rites, no longer were efficacious merely for the physical well-being of the community. They now began to acquire a more lofty connotation, while another class of offerings designated *minḥah* were in the nature of gifts given in recognition of the sovereign claims of God on the nation of His choice. These appear to be quite distinct in origin from those arising out of the royal ritual.

Finally, there is the infinitely loftier conception of redemptive suffering which finds expression in the Servant Saga embedded in the later portion of the book of Isaiah. In these poems of uncertain date

the doctrine of representative suffering emerges in the Servant who bears the sins of the people vicariously. No explanation is given why sinners should be forgiven because an innocent man had suffered, but, nevertheless, it was recognized that sin had to be atoned for, and the sufferings of the righteous Servant were compared to the guilt-offering (*āshām*) (Is 53^{10, 5, 8}). Something had to be done to remove the consequences of sin, and one of the functions of the Servant was to restore the captivity of the exiles and to renew their prosperity (Is 49^{5a}). But it was the deeper problem of vicarious atonement that lay behind the conception of the Suffering Servant, and it was this which received a new solution in the perfect self-offering of God in Christ.

Why Mr. Aldous Huxley is not a Christian.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID CAIRNS, M.A., BRIDGE OF ALLAN.

IN recent years it has become quite the fashion for men and women of letters to give the world a statement of their religious beliefs. Two of them whose writings are of particular interest on this subject are Mr. P'Anson Fausset, and Mr. Aldous Huxley, both of whom have rejected Christianity and accepted a form of mysticism. In a previous article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES I tried to show that Mr. Huxley's mystical cosmology failed to provide a basis for his ethic, which was really very similar to the Christian ethic, and could not really stand unless based on the Christian, or at least a theistic cosmology. In this article I propose to discuss the grounds given by Mr. Huxley, mostly in *Ends and Means*, for his rejection of Christianity. The grounds which he gives are four in number.

The first is that the experience of all the profoundest mystics contradicts the belief that God is personal. He says, 'Those who take the trouble to train themselves in the arduous technique of mysticism always end, if they go far enough in their work of recollection and meditation, by losing their intuitions of a personal God and having direct experience of an ultimate reality that is impersonal' (*Ends and Means*, 235). There are, he says, some mystics who have been much under the influence of the Christian tradition, who have clung to the tenets of the Christian Faith, and have not therefore

ventured out beyond the harbour into the deeps of mystical experience. They have clung to a devotion to a personal Christ and the historical accidentals which the teaching of the Church has imposed on the mystical experience. But certain more daring souls have struck sail and ventured beyond the harbour. There terrible storms have assailed them, and only after many days of storm have they reached calm waters and peace again. For they have realized in the mystical experience that God was not good, was not love, was not personal, and at first the discovery was terrible to them. It seemed like plunging over the abyss, like losing hold of everything on which they had placed reliance. It was the entry into nothingness, the dark night of the soul. Only later did they learn the true peace of union with an impersonal God, only later did they realize that beneath these tossing waves there were the calm depths of the ocean.

Now it seems that Huxley is here making assumptions which beg the whole question. In assuming that these mystics have the profoundest insight into truth he takes for granted without examination a whole cosmology. This cosmology holds that Reality is to be found outside of history, that myself and Reality are essentially one, and that by neglect of the historical I attain to Reality, and find it by plunging into the recesses of the self. By 'the

historical' I mean that whole world of things, events, and above all, persons, with which I meet in the course of my life. According to Huxley's rather naïve assumption, reality is not to be found here, but in mystical recollection and meditation.

It will be rightly objected that there are at least two kinds of mysticism—the first, a mysticism of the self, such as is here criticised; and the second, a mysticism of external intuition, whereby I see the One in the Many, and go on to assert the reality of the One and the superficiality of the Many. But it may well be maintained that Reality, whether it be in ourselves or without us, is historical and individual, it exists as a One *in Many*, and to neglect its given individuality, its objectivity, its historicity, is nothing less than to run away from Reality. It may be claimed that to seek refuge in this type of mysticism is a refusal to take responsibility, that it is nothing better than the two-gramme doses of *soma*, the delightful narcotic with which the inhabitants of the Brave New World indulged themselves. To assert that History, the given, can never decisively reveal Reality, is merely to assert a prejudice, and if you were to expound this theory to a psycho-therapist, his answer might well be—'This may be the profoundest mysticism, but to me it sounds uncommonly like regression.' It is the rejection by the individual of the time-process, history, the created world. It might be worth the psychologist's while to trace a connexion between Nirvana and the mother's womb.

There is one point in Huxley's writings, where he, or at least one of his characters, comes very near to realizing the possibility that there is an alternative to the pantheistic mystical point of view. It is to be found in *Eyeless in Gaza*, 564. 'God—a person or not a person? Quien sabe? Only revelation can decide such metaphysical questions. And revelation isn't playing the game—is equivalent to pulling three aces of trumps from up your sleeve.' He goes on to say that it depends on the way your mind works whether you believe God to be personal or impersonal, he cannot think of Him as personal, and anyway it makes no difference to ethical action.

But the question of the personality of God is not thus indifferent to ethical action, as we have seen, and as Huxley himself admits in *Ends and Means*, though his conclusions are that a finer ethic results from belief in an impersonal God, a conclusion the exact contrary of ours. And the personality of God cannot be thus flippantly decided by individual preference as men choose a blue or a green tie. And why should revelation be ruled out of court *a priori*? Is it not the *a priori* denial of it that is

unfair, like the pulling of *four aces of trumps* from up your sleeve? That there is Revelation can only be decided in the particular case, when a particular claim is made that *this* is Revelation. At this point Huxley seems like a man standing on the top-step of a diving board, one foot hanging over the edge, and apparently unconscious that there is any drop before him, unaware that at any moment he may be swimming out of his depth. Why is it unfair to be asked to believe in Revelation? He would not be asked to believe without grounds. A man of Huxley's acuteness, having got so near the edge, may well soon take the plunge—not into the dark night of the soul, but into the waters of Christianity!

When Mr. Huxley says that all the *profoundest* mystics have believed in an impersonal God, one has the feeling that this does not necessarily mean very much at all. Possibly no more than just the fact that these mystics are the ones with whom he feels himself for the moment most in sympathy. And he chooses some strange companions. When he accepts the revelations of Marie Lataste rather than the words of Christ as to the nature of God, one feels inclined to ask upon what grounds is this done? Perhaps the answer would be given that this girl's experience is taken merely to confirm that of countless mystics. But may I imitate Mr. Huxley's example and repeat to him his maxim, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' Is it not probable that one who had the ethical insight of Jesus would be more likely to have the truth about God in his teaching than Marie Lataste in hers? With Huxley's strictures on Christ's character I have yet to deal. But he seems to me perilously near the error of Edward Irving and his friends, who believed in 'speaking with tongues' and received anything that was said 'in the power' without exercising upon it their moral judgment, without judging it by its fruits. That an experience came in a mystic trance is no criterion of its value. It must be subjected to ethical and rational tests, as William James discovered after his experiments with laughing-gas, during which he became converted to Hegelianism, and wrote down in mystical raptus the divinely inspired words 'Nothing is Nothing, all is Othing!'

The second ground on which Mr. Huxley rejects personal theism and Christianity is that person-worship always leads to intolerance. With all that he says about the worship of Hitler or 'Father Divine' having a corrupting influence on the character of the worshipper it is easy to agree. And it is unfortunately too true that in the past Christians have a sullied record of persecution. The attempt

to propagate Christianity by force rests upon a fundamental misunderstanding of the Christian Faith. The temptation to do so was one of the temptations which Christ resisted at the beginning of His ministry. He believed that it was a temptation from the devil, and called Peter 'Satan' when he tried to move Him back to such an ideal from the way He had chosen for Himself. The Roman Church with its inquisitions and persecutions has utterly failed to understand this fundamental fact of the Christian Faith that it cannot be propagated by force. So, too, did the Reformers, though their successors have since seen their error and repented of it. For before building the monument to the Reformers at Geneva, they set up a tablet to Servetus, who should have been treated with love, and not burnt at the stake, however wrong-headed and foolish he may have been.

It is, moreover, relevant to point out that peace, liberty, justice, and brotherly love, are the aims which Christendom would have set before itself all through the two thousand years of its existence, if it had been true to the spirit of its Founder. That it has not always done this is to its shame, and is due to the way in which Christians have avoided the moral challenge of Christ. We do not need to take all Huxley's indictment at its face-value, but we must confess the treason of Christians to Christ. And we must emphatically deny that these shortcomings are due to defects inherent in His character, or in His view of God as personal. His whole teaching is that men should be pure and merciful and kind because God is these things. And how an educated man like Mr. Huxley can be so ignorant of the Gospels as to assert that Christianity teaches the opposite, passes my understanding.

It is, however, true that literalist views of Biblical inspiration have led to a pernicious misunderstanding of Christian Ethics. But be this as it may, such an Ethic is a radical error and misunderstanding of the Gospel; it is devil's work, and turns Christianity into its contrary. And it is preposterous to say that it is the natural fruit of belief in a personal God. It is the fruit of human sin and obtuseness and stupidity.

According to Mr. Huxley on the other hand the fruits of mysticism are always love and peace and toleration, while those of Christianity are persecution and intolerance. Can it be shown that the mediæval mystics ever uttered any word of protest against persecution? Did they not approve when the Albigenses and others were hounded out of existence? Does Mr. Huxley not know that Hinduism sent the early Buddhists to the stake,

impaling them for their faith, and forcibly expelling Buddhism from India?

What are we to make of this statement from Otto's *Mysticism East and West*? 'The variety of different types of mystical experience can result in estrangement and conflict. It was the Mystics who warred against the Mystic ibn Mansur al Hallaj, and helped to bring him to the cross, while he himself, from the standpoint of another type of experience, fought against the mysticism of his day' (p. 40, trans., Macmillan, 1932). How are we to account for the fact that Eckhart, whom Mr. Huxley admires, was acclaimed as a forerunner by Hegel, whom he hates? That Eckhart's works are constantly appearing in new editions in Nazi Germany, and that Rosenberg has acclaimed him as 'the Creator of Aryan Religion and the Incarnation of Odin'?¹

This persecuting side of Mysticism is only natural, for non-Christian mysticism strips God of all moral attributes, and asserts that the way to union with Deity lies through the exaltation of one or other trait in human nature or society—the self, race, sex, the State. Or, else, reacting from an uncritical affirmation of the world or some element in it, mysticism becomes so negative in its attitude to the world that its devotees do not trouble to stand up for human rights at all, and allow persecution free course while they pursue their communion with the All.

If we use the criterion 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' taking up Mr. Huxley's challenge, we shall see historically an overwhelmingly strong case may be made out for Christianity over against pantheistic mysticism in its record of service to man and his freedom. In spite of its dreadful sins and mistakes, historical Christianity has given us nearly all the freedom we possess, and most of the toleration and mercy. And is not the decline of respect for Christianity one cause of the regression to barbarism which Huxley so justly notices? But if we compare the teachings of Christ about God, and the teachings of non-Christian mysticism, we can be left in no shadow of doubt as to which cosmology the ethic of Huxley demands if it is to be valid.

The third ground why Huxley rejects Christian theism is that the character of Christ is imperfect, showing both faults of omission and commission. The usual examples are given of Jesus' sins of commission. It is asserted that He used violence in

¹ Letter by Professor F. M. Powicke in the 'Times Literary Supplement,' 18th July 1935, quoted in *Is Christianity Unique?* p. 81, by Dr. Nicol Macnicol.

the Temple. Let us leave undiscussed the question as to whether Jesus might have used physical force in the Temple without incurring moral stigma from His action. But this very story is often cited by Christian pacifists as an instance of the victory of moral force against overwhelming physical odds. It is also claimed that the scourge used by Jesus was only used against the cattle in the Temple. This incident is therefore surely most uncertain ground on which to build a moral condemnation of Jesus as a man of violence. Then, as we might expect, the story of the Gadarene swine is cited. Mr. Huxley here takes up a point vehemently debated half a century ago by his relative T. H. Huxley and Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Huxley asks if it was not a sin in Jesus to destroy the herd of Gadarene swine as the narrative of Mark tells in the story of the healing of the demoniac? (Mk 5¹⁻²⁰).

Now there are two possible ways of interpreting this singular story. Either we may take it as the story of the cure of a madman, or, like the Gospel writers, we may believe in real 'possession' by evil spirits. The former view is held by many convinced Christian believers, who find no difficulty in holding that Christ, in all matters of merely scientific diagnosis shared the beliefs of His contemporaries. On this view the headlong flight and death of the swine must have been caused by the panic induced by the contortions of the lunatic. Phenomena of this kind, it is well known, are incidents in psychotherapeutic treatment. It would be as unreasonable to blame Christ for this, as to blame the healer for the destruction of property caused by such unhappy victims of mental disorder in the process of treatment. It may be safely assumed that this, or something like this, is Mr. Huxley's own view of the story, behind the narrative. His argument is therefore a pure *argumentum ad hominem*, addressed simply to those who hold the more conservative view of possession. It is very difficult to believe that he himself finds any moral turpitude here in the Jesus of History.

On the other view of real possession by demons and their actual entrance into the scene, it has been pointed out by Christian scholars that Christ in the matter is reported by Mark as having merely given permission to the evil spirits to enter into the flock. That the lawless spirits wreaked their anger as they did by destroying the flock, lay outside his sphere of action, and might even be recorded as an attempt to take vengeance on Him who had driven them out, by getting Him in turn eliminated from the region, as actually happened. Whichever view we take, it is surely clear that Mr. Huxley is, here

as in the other case, on exceedingly precarious ground.

It is true that argument on the matter of Christ's sinlessness is not easy. The Christian has two lines of argument. He can point to the general impression made on him by the character of Jesus and His claims. There is the ethical standard set up by Jesus for Himself and others in the Sermon on the Mount. And yet, in spite of this tremendously high moral standard set by Him, Jesus seems to have had no sense of guilt. Then there is the universal belief of His disciples that He was sinless, from which we may infer that in all His three years intimacy with them He never once confessed sin to them, nor did anything that shook them in their absolute conviction that He was without sin. The whole argument on this side is cumulative, but it is necessarily in part an argument from silence. For the man not committed to faith it would be enough to prove one glaring instance of sin or of consciousness of sin in Jesus to destroy the whole Christian argument. And in spite of all the arguments, in spite also of the stories cited by Mr. Huxley, I submit that this has not been done.

As to faults of omission in Christ cited by Mr. Huxley, it seems that he has mistaken the nature of the Bible. It is not meant as a symposium of all beauty, truth, and goodness, in spite of its many passages of superb beauty. Jesus, to win Huxley's obedience, would have to be a kind of Admirable Crichton of all the arts and virtues—the perfectly balanced genius, a greater Goethe, without Goethe's exasperating self-complacency and limitations. But is that possible, or desirable? One sees here a God-man constructed in Mr. Huxley's own image, without his limitations or ethical imperfections. But what good would such a Jesus have been to the world?

There is a Christian doctrine called the kenosis-doctrine, which would be worth Mr. Huxley's while to study. This doctrine maintains that, in order to become true man, Christ had to accept limitations of knowledge and power. He became a man as other men. He did not know beforehand the date of the end of the world. His aim was not to instruct mankind in relativity or geography. He may have been mistaken in his belief about the authorship of the 110th Psalm. But He did know what the Father had committed to His charge—the mission given Him to win back the world to God. And He did know one thing important above all others—that, apart from obedience to God and love of Him, all human gifts were tainted. We believe that He made possible the new way of life for men,

by coming to them across the gulf from God. And this not even Goethe or Sankara did.

Call the character of Jesus one-sided if you will, Christians maintain that only in this amazing new life is the true place of the arts to be seen. The fact that Christian or imperfectly Christian influences have sometimes failed to foster culture and art is no more damnatory of Christ than is the fact that beauty and art have sometimes held a man back from obedience to the will of God—a proof that beauty and culture come from the devil. God is the source of all truth and beauty, but above all things there comes obedience to His will, and sometimes such obedience may cause an impoverishment in the æsthetic quality of a man's life. But in the end, we believe, the harvest will be richer. This does not mean that religion may use second-rate art in order to capture a temporary popularity, or that in the service of God a man or a church should fetter free inquiry. But it does mean that sometimes the call of God may come to a man to serve others practically in some other way, rather than by taking up the intellectual or artistic way of life, and that God's will is always to be obeyed.

Mr. Huxley's fourth ground of objection to the doctrine of a personal God is that it means a curtailment of personal freedom. Of all his objections this is the most weighty—a vital concern is here at stake. The problem here touched upon is one of the most crucial problems of theology. What is the real meaning of freedom? What is the real nature of persons, and how do they attain to it? This is the crucial problem of philosophy and consequently also of politics. Here even those who do not agree with the theology of Principal John Oman will realize that the main thesis in all his work is of central importance. This thesis is that God never compels the soul by an irresistible grace or authority, but so helps it that it finds its own true freedom in a willing response to His love. Here Roman Catholicism on the one hand and strict Calvinism on the other, fall grievously short. The alternative placed before man is, as Professor Leonard Hodgson

says, not that between obeying God and obeying the dictates of a rebellious reason. It is the choice between obeying God from the highest motives and obeying Him from a lower motive—because He is the God who wields the big stick. And if one believes the truth in the Bible, not because it is the truth to which the Holy Spirit within us bears witness, the truth which shines by its own light, but because the Church demands that one should believe it—it is no longer the truth which one is obeying, but the big stick, the fear of damnation.

In spite of the tyrannic domination of persons which is exercised to-day by different forms of the community, it is still a generally accepted truth in progressive modern philosophy that only in free fellowship with persons do persons come to possess and exercise their personal being. Personality is self-transcendence in communion with other personal beings. And is it too much to ask Mr. Huxley to believe that persons have their personal being and freedom in the last resort because of their relation to a personal God who will not force Himself upon them, and loves them into being and perfection, and redeems them from their misuse of freedom by His suffering. Outside of this there is no real guarantee of personal freedom.

We cannot but be grateful to Aldous Huxley for the charm of his style and also for that very clarity of vision which at times makes him such depressing reading. But it is necessary to point out that the polemical position taken up in *Ends and Means* is much more vulnerable than it seems on a first reading. To change the figure, the picture of Mr. Huxley rejecting Christianity and trying to get motive power for his ethic from a pantheist cosmology is like nothing so much as the spectacle of a man who has driven away his pony and harnessed his dog-cart to a clothes-horse, and now stands up in the driving seat lustily cracking the whip round its wooden ribs, believing that at last, if he but chirrup to it industriously enough, it will gallop forward carrying him and his belongings out of the morass in which they are embedded.

Literature.

PROPHECY AND DIVINATION.

THE Bampton Lectures for 1938 were delivered by Principal Alfred Guillaume, D.D., best known to the general public for his share in Gore's Commentary. His subject was *Prophecy and Divination*, and the Lectures have now appeared in a volume bearing that title (Hodder & Stoughton; 20s. net). They treat of the Sumero-Babylonian Religion, the Hebræo-Arabian Religion, Divinatory Prophecy, Dreams and Visions, Magic and Sorcery, Ecstasy, and Personal Religion; seven additional notes of varying length deal with points of interest which arise out of the main line of thought but are not essential to it.

The importance of Dr. Guillaume's work for the study of prophecy lies in his intimate knowledge of Arabic literature and thought. He accepts the normal contrast between the two types of religion represented in Israelite history, and seeks for parallels with Hebrew prophecy in both Mesopotamia and Arabia. It can hardly be said that the quest is successful; the 'ecstatic' elements certainly to be found in Islam cannot be shown to have appeared in early Arabian religion, and the methods of the Muslim diviner have, at bottom, little in common with those of the Hebrew prophet, in spite of superficial resemblances. The latter was essentially a person subject to an abnormal psychological condition, which may or may not (scholars are not yet agreed on this point) have been accompanied by abnormal behaviour. It was in this state that he came consciously into immediate contact with God, and received the divine message for himself and for his people. The various elements in the whole phenomenon are found in almost every land and in almost every age; their combination in what is often called 'ecstatic prophecy' has, in ancient times at any rate, a limited range. The occasional references in Mesopotamian literature, to which Dr. Guillaume alludes, do not justify us in attributing to it a Sumerian or Akkadian origin. Dr. Guillaume's facts, which are beyond dispute, lead us to ascribe it to a 'Canaanite' rather than to an 'Hebræo-Arabian' source. But, once more, that source does not appear to be Semitic at all, and we may guess that it was derived from Anatolia. True, the Hittite material so far discovered has thrown no light on the matter, but we have as yet had com-

paratively little that bears on Hittite religious theory and practice. Certainly Asia Minor seems to have been the radiating centre from which this special form of communication between the divine and the human spread over the Mediterranean world.

Dr. Guillaume's work is a monument of learning and of patient investigation. But the results of it are negative rather than positive. There are some valuable features in the book, the most impressive being the fine estimate of the true Dervish spirit and outlook. In general, however, the effect is to make the reader feel that Old Testament prophecy was unique; there is always something lacking in parallels and similarities adduced from other religions, and we lay the book down with the enhanced conviction that the Holy Spirit spoke through these men as He has never spoken through any others.

SOLITUDE AND SOCIETY.

It is being more and more recognized by more and more readers of serious, thought-provoking literature that Nicolas Berdyaev is one of the greatest thinkers of our time. His latest work to be translated will confirm that impression. It bears the title *Solitude and Society* (Geoffrey Bles; 8s. 6d. net). The translation has been well done by Mr. George Reavey. We have just one doubt as to whether the term 'erotic' is in English usage quite suitable; though we freely grant that it is next to impossible to find an adjective corresponding to the kind of love of which Berdyaev has so much to say. The book is in five sections which are rightly headed 'Meditations.' While the book is a unity, yet one feels that it is not in 'chapters.' We may give the subjects of the meditations in order; they are: 'The Philosopher's Tragic Situation and the Problems of Philosophy'; 'The Subject and Objectivation'; 'The Ego, Solitude and Society'; 'The Evil of Time, Change, and Eternity'; 'Personality, Society, and Communion.'

These, be it remembered, are the subjects of 'meditation'; and to get the full flavour of them and benefit from them, they must be read slowly and meditatively. Keen dialectic and sustained argument are blended with a mystical element which at first appears exotic and elusive to the Anglo-Saxon

mind. Serious study of the book, however, will amply repay itself.

Readers who are familiar with Martin Buber's 'Ich und Du' will have a great initial advantage; Berdyaev accepts Buber's view so far as it goes, but finds that it does not go far enough. Buber did not 'consider the relationship between two human beings nor the diverse relationships implied in the multiple life of mankind,' nor 'the problem of social and human metaphysics, that of the "We."' So to complete Buber's work becomes Berdyaev's task.

The central position of the book is this—It is shown how man becomes aware of his 'terrifying solitude' and strives often fruitlessly to overcome it. The only way to overcome it is the way of love. The 'I' must find a 'Thou' and the twain become a 'We.'

True community among men, their communion in the spirit—on that alone may our hopes be founded. That alone will lead us to that truth which will make us free. It is an essential point with Berdyaev that 'to treat of man is also to treat of God.' 'At the present time it is imperative to understand once more that the rediscovery of man will also be the rediscovery of God,' and that he finds to be the essential theme of Christianity.

CHURCH BUILDING.

Architecture is generally regarded as a somewhat dull subject, and Carlyle's phrase 'Frozen Music,' though intended to be laudatory, has not made it more attractive to the average person. But Mr. Basil F. L. Clarke, M.A., has changed all that in his *Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), and has produced a most readable and attractively bound book in which a mass of information is presented not only interestingly but even racy. Perhaps the author sometimes allows his wit and humour to outrun his discretion, and his Epilogue suggests that he himself is conscious of this fault, for he says: 'There is a certain amount that is comic in the history that we have tried to sketch, and a little that is irritating, and a great deal that is regrettable. But there is also much that is noble and good. If this book has seemed to emphasize what is comic or contemptible, that has not been my purpose.' Here are a few of his trenchant remarks: Commenting on the Gothic revival, he writes: 'In spite of all the good intentions, in spite of the study of the purest examples, in spite of the moral excellence of the

clergy, in spite of the advice of the Camdenians to the workmen not to swear; in spite of everything, the new churches were failures.' He pours scorn on the recommendation of the decorated style of the period in the pages of the smug 'Ecclesiologist,' that periodical which worked so hard for the Gothic Revival. 'So Decorated' [Gothic], he says, 'besides its other merits, had that of being suitable for the poor. The Church, of course, at this time did not think of pulling down the slums.' He disapproves, and justly, of the over-ornamentation of the Victorian style. 'They delighted in the rich appearance of the constructive coloration, and loved to write in their guide-books of the various materials in cathedral reredoses and pulpits—lapis lazuli, verde antico, rosso antico, Vecchia marble, Carrara marble, Mexican onyx, and the rest. The names are attractive: the things themselves are less so.' And where he quotes from other authors it is always the most spicy items that he selects. For example, from Pugin: 'After all, my dear sir, "What's the use of decent vestments with such priests as we have got? a lot of blessed fellows! Why, sir, when they wear my chasubles, they don't look like priests, and what's worse, the chasubles don't look like chasubles."' And to the Victorian argument, voiced also by Ruskin as well as Pugin, that personal goodness influences an architect's style, he replies: 'There is no reason why a bad man should not design a "good" building. There is only too much evidence that good men can design bad buildings.'

The whole book of two hundred and ninety-six pages is practically a detailed criticism of the work of the leading Victorian architects such as Edward Blore, George Frederick Bodley, Raphael Brandon, Hodgson Fowler, Temple Moore, Graham Paley, Loughborough Pearson, Prynne, Pugin, Gilbert Scott, Street, and Wyatt, just to select a few from among a hundred or more. Excellent illustrations of the churches are included, and a most valuable appendix giving the list of churches built by each architect.

A chapter is devoted to architectural styles and another to shattering any lingering belief we might still possess in architectural symbolism. Ruskin and Pugin are suitably derided, and long, frequent and spirited attacks are made on the Tractarians, the 'Ecclesiologist,' the Camdenites, and, in fact, on most of the Victorian ideologists. Hence his apologetic epilogue and his final pious words: 'We can laugh at some of it: but for most of it we should be grateful, and for much of it we should do well to thank God.'

GRÆCO-ORIENTAL LITERATURE.

History and Romance in Græco-Oriental Literature, by Mr. Martin Braun, Ph.D., D.Phil. (Blackwell; 7s. 6d. net), communicates the results of researches which, as Professor A. J. Toynbee says in the Preface, are pioneer work in a *terra incognita*. The work is dedicated to Manchester College, Oxford, which awarded Dr. Braun a senior research studentship and secured for him, an exile from Germany, freedom and friendship. One cannot but be impressed with the learning and scholarly ability which the work displays. So packed full, indeed, are its hundred pages that it makes far from easy reading. The studies contained in the two chapters are said to be of special interest to New Testament scholars as seeking to illustrate the collision between Judaism and Hellenism out of which Christianity emerged. The first chapter deals with 'The National Character of Hero Romance,' and the subject is illustrated from the popular anonymous literature of fiction in the Hellenistic world. The figures of Ninus and Semiramis, Sesostris, Nectanebus, Moses, and Alexander flit across the pages. The second chapter deals with 'Biblical Legend in Jewish-Hellenistic Literature,' and special reference is made to the treatment of the Potiphar story in the 'Testament of Joseph' (which is part of the Jewish apocryphal 'Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs'). It is claimed that the importance of this document for the religious and ethical development of later Judaism and for the origins of Christianity cannot be assessed too highly. We must leave it to the specialist to assess the value of such a claim.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS.

The Psychology of Social Movements, by Mr. Pryns Hopkins, M.A., Ph.D. (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), is an attempt to give a psycho-analytic view of society. It surveys the needs of man in various aspects of his personality—his possessions, his children, his sensory enjoyments, his knowledge, etc. Dr. Hopkins is concerned with teaching the politician and reformer to marshal the data put at their disposal. He wishes also to be of real assistance to individuals in their personal fears, and in their relationships. The individual who begins to reflect about his moral behaviour will quickly discover that at first he approved principally of those things which fostered his own well-being, which gave him happiness, but that gradually his moral approval was extended to embrace those

things which gave his family and friends happiness, and finally, which gave the maximum happiness for every one. These later stages involve the acceptance of what is called 'unselfishness,' namely, an approval of certain courses of action which promote the welfare of others even at the expense of himself. To those of us who are serious expositors of the New Testament it seems a little presuming for a learned psychologist to elaborate this somewhat prosaically, as part of 'the roots of social ethics,' when Jesus in His parables gives expression to the same high doctrine with much more simplicity and art. Yet it is a healthy sign if with a somewhat laboured 'approach' the psycho-analyst is moving towards the altruistic spirit of unacknowledged Christian teaching. Dr. Hopkins shows that it is not because men are incapable of reasoning logically about things that they fail to reach conclusions. A man's reason he contends can hardly be free, if he himself be a slave to want or greed. It is here where the practical analyst becomes so useful to society in teaching the genesis of the numberless 'complexes' that afflict the tortured mind. Certain children harbour a sense of unnatural resentment to parents. Afterwards when they learn to love them, they try to absolve them from hatred by projecting it on *substitutes*. The wider significance of this appears in antagonistic groups of capital and labour arrayed against one another, and against the business groups of foreign countries.

There are large tracts of this treatise which deal with diagnosis of mental phobias, etc.; and much of this does not come within the scope of a theological magazine. It is very suggestive, however, to discover that the mystery of pain, unsolved since the days of Job, drives the author once and again to face the problem of faith.

Not the least valued part of the book is that in which Dr. Hopkins defends the psycho-analyst's craftsmanship. His reasoning is cogent; and although we lay down his apologia feeling that all the difficulties are not solved, we feel that to the Church he has provided a certain challenge. Is there not room within her remedial system, as he suggests, for an emphasis not alone on sin but on *symptom*? Has she not a message for troubled minds as well as erring souls? If we could only teach people how to behave, how to think, and how to be effective, we should have laid the foundations of Utopia—this is his plea. Until we have so taught them, chaos and tragedy will stalk the stage of this world, crushing endeavour, blighting hopes, shattering dreams.

CONTINENTAL THEOLOGY.

In his recent book, *Contemporary Continental Theology* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net), Dr. Walter Marshall Horton of Oberlin College has done a good service to students of the history of theological thought, and at the same time refuted the charge of 'theological nationalism' of which he was accused when he published in 1936 a work on 'Contemporary English Theology.' Those who know Dr. Horton's writings will expect to find in him a lively guide in his chosen field, and they will not be disappointed.

Here are some words from the Introduction: 'Continental theologians have in common one thing that is usually lacking among us: a sense of what they often call a "fourth dimension," barely suspected in our neat, orderly, three-dimensional world; a fourth dimension full of terror as well as glory, demons as well as angels, and only to be known through suffering; yet so fascinating and compelling to those who have known it that they would never again be content in our plumbers' paradise, nor exchange their apocalyptic torment for an eternity of our bourgeois bliss.'

In contemporary Continental thought Dr. Horton observes a manifold richness in the dimension of depth: (1) in the Bible (Karl Barth); (2) in the relation between God and the world (Barth and Heim, Przywara and Berdyaev); (3) in the soul of man (Dostoevsky and Berdyaev); (4) in the mystery of iniquity (Heim, Otto Piper, Paul Tillich); (5) in the work of Christ (Aulén); (6) in the Church and the State (Maritain, Brunner, Althaus); (7) in the mystery of the future (Althaus, Heim). And under the influence of his study of Continental theology he is led to declare himself a liberal or evangelical Catholic, as believing in the need of a reinvigorated liberal Protestantism. For in his opinion the truth in liberal Protestantism is much better conserved by Maritain and Berdyaev than by Barth and Heim. This does not mean, however, that he proposes to leave the Protestant fold.

The four chapters of the book consider in succession the Rediscovery of Orthodox Theology (that is, the Orthodox or Greek renaissance as represented by the layman Berdyaev and the priest Bulgakov), the Revival of Catholic Theology (as represented by the critic Maritain and the constructive thinker Przywara), the Crisis in German Protestant Theology (results of which are the extreme Confessionalism of Barth and the extreme 'Aryanism' of Rosenberg), and Protestant Theology

outside of Germany (in Scandinavia, Holland, France, and Central Europe).

The compilation of these pages was necessarily a hurried piece of work, and no doubt the author has been tempted to pronounce hasty judgments in places and to accept information on hearsay, but many will be indebted to him for a work interesting as it is timely.

Professor Burton Scott Easton, an American scholar well known in this country by his works on the Gospels, has published a most interesting book: *What Jesus Taught* (Abingdon Press; \$1.50). It is a collection of the sayings of Jesus, translated and arranged with an expository commentary. The first part of the volume contains the sayings, given under headings like 'Anger,' 'Pride,' and sometimes more striking headings like 'Evasion,' 'Irrelevant Matters.' The arrangement follows a division into main subjects: Righteousness, The Father, The Mission, The Rejection and Conversion. The sub-headings, such as those quoted above, are frequently introduced by a line or two explaining the context. The second part of the book consists of commentary. But it is not expansive. Only so much is given as will make the sayings intelligible.

It will be apparent that this book is one that will open up the Gospels to any intelligent and inquiring mind. It is an attractive book outwardly, well printed and well spaced. It is equally attractive in its contents. Not all of its opinions will find general agreement. The conception of the Kingdom of God, for example, on p. 67 is a surprising one, coming from such a scholar. But controversial matter is for the most part absent, and the book as a whole is a real gift to the Bible student. We can hardly believe that the writer is responsible for the jacket which is inappropriate for a book addressed to adults.

God's Table, by the Rev. John E. Charlton (Abingdon Press; 75c.), contains thirty Communion addresses for young people. These addresses are exceedingly brief and simple, taking only a minute or two to deliver, and each dealing with some one thought connected with the Holy Supper. In two introductory chapters some account is given of a custom which seems to be spreading in Protestant churches in America of admitting children to Communion, not merely along with their parents but in classes and groups from Sunday School.

This is a question which may soon have to be faced by churches on this side of the Atlantic. If children rightly receive the Sacrament of Baptism on the faith of their parents, why should they not also partake with their parents of the Holy Supper as the Jewish children partake of the Passover?

Copernicus: The Founder of Modern Astronomy, by Mr. Angus Armitage, M.Sc. (Allen & Unwin; 10s. net), is a book of great interest, especially to students of astronomy. There are perhaps too many geometrical figures on its pages to attract the general reader, yet it is written with admirable clearness and is not really difficult. It is fitted among other things to correct the popular notion that the Copernican system was a complete revolution from all that had gone before. The astronomical knowledge of the ancients was very extraordinary and worthy of our deepest respect. 'The reformative ideas which we associate with Copernicus are not to be regarded as original products of his genius. His great contribution to astronomy lay rather in his development of those ideas (that is, the ideas of the ancients) into a systematic planetary theory.' May it be added, in a journal devoted to theological study, that popular writers and preachers who foster the idea that to the ancients the universe was 'static,' or was 'a cosy little world in three flats' betray the grossest ignorance. Further, in reply to the current notion that the Copernican system is religiously upsetting, it need only be said that Copernicus himself never so regarded it. The book before us is a very fine example of work which is at once authoritative and popular.

Dr. Campbell N. Moody has already written books that have made a place for themselves in our understanding of the gospel, and the author of 'The Heathen Heart' has added to our debt by a very original and telling work on *The Childhood of the Church* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). His main thesis is that the gospel is strange and antipathetic to the natural man. It was so to the Early Church. They evaded its message in all kinds of ways. It was so to the early Fathers. They laid the emphasis elsewhere than where the New Testament does. It is so in the mission field to-day. And it is so among ourselves. The doctrine of grace to the undeserving, with its correlative of salvation through faith alone, is against all our instincts and preferences. Incidentally that is a strong argument for the authenticity of our sources. Dr. Moody points this out. But his chief object is to stress the

element of grace in the gospel, and to show why this is not easily received.

We would draw attention to a volume of sermons published by Messrs. Atkinson at 2s. 6d. net. The title is *Respectable Sins*, and the topics dealt with are Hypocrisy, Worry, Unfaithfulness, Pride, Vindictiveness, Worldliness, etc. The author is the Rev. Hugh Elder, M.A. The thought is clearly put and easy to follow, each topic being divided up under a number of heads. With regard to worry, for example, Mr. Elder makes the points: it is unreasoning; it is unavailing; it is unbelieving; it is unchristian; and it is unwise. The print is clear and the volume pleasant to handle.

It is difficult to see how the Dean of Durham, Dr. C. A. Alington, finds time to write his various books. And here is another, bigger than its predecessors and certainly as good, if not better—*The New Testament, a Reader's Guide* (Bell; 5s. net). It is a New Testament Introduction, with one special feature. After some preliminary matter Dr. Alington gets to grips with his main business. Each of the books of the New Testament, after being suitably introduced, is described chapter by chapter. Its contents are explained, and notes are interspersed at all points where they are necessary or helpful. Any one who wishes to understand, or appreciate, his New Testament will find this book a very great help.

The scholarship is sound. The point of view is as sound: 'If Jesus Christ was not the Incarnate Son of God, if He did not die on the Cross and rise again from the dead, His teaching would no doubt remain of value, but the Christian religion would inevitably perish.' That is the author's faith. But he is no obscurantist. He admits the freedom with which Matthew and Luke use Mark. He thinks that there are Pauline elements in the Pastoral Letters, but no more. He clings, however, to the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and he makes the excellent suggestion that this Gospel should not be read after the Synoptists but after Colossians and Ephesians. It would then be found to be entirely natural and inevitable. The book is full of helpful matter, like the hints on how to study Paul's letters, and indeed it will make the Bible a new book to many. There are some excellent maps, clear and not over-loaded with detail.

Canon S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D., accepting an invitation to preach the sermon at the 'Annual Commemoration of Benefactors' of Salisbury, made

an ancestor of his own the subject. The sermon has been published with notes—*John Prideaux* (Bennett Brothers, Salisbury; 1s. net). John Prideaux was born in 1578, one of a large and poor family. He showed desire and ability to learn; and helped by benefactors made his way to Oxford. At the age of thirty-three he was made Rector and Head of his own College. Various distinctions and honours were given him, and in 1641 he became Bishop of Worcester. His last days were passed amid the turmoil of Civil War, and, expelled from his See, he ended his days in Bredon Rectory. He wrote a considerable number of books on a variety of topics. Altogether he was one of the most serviceable men of his period; and we are grateful to Canon Prideaux for giving us a memoir of his worthy forbear.

Mr. W. W. Lucas, M.A., LL.M., Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and Inner Temple, has written a book on *The Primordial Functions of Government and the Legal Status of Sovereignty* (Bowes & Bowes, Cambridge; 7s. 6d. net). In the 'Legal Foreword' Lord Macmillan explains that the author's purpose has been to set forth the functions of government as fundamentally threefold: creative, discretionary, and ministerial. In the 'Theological Foreword' Canon Raven comments on the Epilogue to the book, in which the author is credited with disclosing 'a real and illuminating analogy between the threefold functions of law and the threefold manifestation of God.' The author himself recognizes that the parallel he has instituted may be held to be a coincidence or a mere parallel, but he urges with learning and acumen that the same three functions exist both in human and in divine government.

In his Yale Lectures on 'The Present Crisis in University Education,' President Robert Maynard Hutchins of Chicago contrasted the state of the University when the theologians determined its educational policy with the condition which now obtains, greatly to the advantage of the former. His indictment against the modern University was that it has no unifying principle to give definiteness and consistency to its policy. As it can no longer accept theology as its unifying principle, it must—he continued—either abandon the hope of unification or put up with the best attainable substitute for theology, which can only be metaphysics. But Professor Emeritus William Adams Brown, Ph.D., D.D., in a recent book, *The Case for Theology in the University* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. net), joins issue with President Hutchins,

examining the reason why theology has lost its central place in the American University of to-day, considering whether metaphysics could be a substitute for theology, and seeking to show how theology should be restored to its place in the American University of to-morrow. The issue between the two writers is not so sharp as at first sight appears; for we learn that for President Hutchins metaphysics includes natural theology and for Professor Adams Brown theology in this context is natural rather than dogmatic theology.

The Cambridge University Press has issued a new edition of the Authorized Version of the Bible, printed in type specially designed for this edition and containing the Apocrypha—*The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha* (3s. 6d. and upwards). The editors point out how serious a typographical problem the printing of the Bible presents. Three-quarters of a million words (the equivalent of seven novels) have to be compressed within the covers of a single volume at a reasonable price. No one can call three shillings and sixpence an unreasonable price for such a work, more especially as it includes the Apocrypha, which is so hard to procure at any fair price. Many readers will value this edition for its inclusion of the Apocrypha. But it has many other merits, among which may be counted its clear type. Let us hope the enterprise of the Cambridge Press will be amply rewarded. It should be added that the original full Preface with its characteristic quaint language is restored to its place in this volume, and with the volume is included a photographic reproduction of the original 'Royal Injunctions' ordering that the Bible in English be set up in every parish church.

There are probably many people, especially young people, who would like help in their Bible reading but cannot afford the price of a book on the subject. To help these people, and members of such bodies as a Girls' Auxiliary, a Summer school or Bible class, an inexpensive pamphlet has been issued by a group of six people on *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Carey Press; 3d.). It contains sufficient introduction, notes on each chapter, and questions for discussion. The little book is very well done for the purpose the editors have in mind.

The Doctor Comes to Lui, by Mrs. Eileen Fraser (C.M.S.; 1s. net), tells the fascinating story of a medical mission in the southern Sudan. Mrs. Fraser writes with beautiful simplicity and complete

self-effacement. Only from the Introduction by Bishop Gwynne do we gather how heroically she and her husband laboured till he was called home in 1935. The little book, which is unusually well illustrated, is an inspiring record of missionary zeal and of the triumphs of divine grace. Here is a beautiful paragraph about their work among lepers, 'There is no class of patients more pathetic and more delightful than the African leper. It has been our experience that this dreadful disease generally singles out the nicest and the most interesting members of the community. It is only when they feel that they are no longer wanted in the world, and that the hand of the spirits is heavily upon them, that they seem to lose their soul and personality. When they see that we personally care for them and when they learn that God wants them and loves them, they respond and open out like the flower to the morning sun.'

We have received, and acknowledge with thanks, from Mr. Francis Darwin a revised reprint of two articles which he contributed to 'The Church Quarterly Review' in the first half of the current year. The title is *The Holy Inquisition: Suppression of Witnesses' Names*. Mr. Darwin has conducted a laborious research into the matter and all his statements are documented. It is a revelation of the notions as to evidence that guided the Holy Office.

It was inevitable that the new physics should influence philosophic as well as scientific theory, and Mr. J. W. Dunne has gained a wide reputation for his work in this field. In *The New Immortality* (Faber; 3s. 6d. net) he sets out to give a popular explanation of the 'serial' theory of time worked out in his previous books, 'An Experiment in Time' and 'The Serial Universe.' This treatment is at first childishly simple, but presently we are plunged into Minkowski's four dimensional world. The concept of time is in any case a mysterious entity, but when it is united with the velocity of light and introduced under a minus sign we find it frankly inconceivable. For certain calculations in physics this concept, if it can be called a concept, may be necessary and useful, but it cannot be allowed to dominate the whole world of thought. We must firmly intimate that we refuse to be intimidated by the square root of minus one. Mr. Dunne's 'serialism' implies that past, present, and future are all equally real and together form a field through which we move. Nothing can come into existence or pass out of it. Yet the future is

contingent, for Mr. Dunne is no determinist. How these positions are to be reconciled we are left to imagine. It is assumed without any suggestion of proof that at death we get the free range of past and future just as we do in dreams, and it is also assumed that that *post-mortem* dream-world will be one of harmonious constructions. Hamlet had his doubts about that. 'For in that sleep of death what dreams may come.' He dreaded the possibility of an eternal nightmare. Mr. Dunne would reassure him by a pantheistic suggestion that our minds are little bits of the Universal Mind. 'We need go no further. We can leave it to the Super-Mind to look after the bits of His own Mind.'

The Rev. M. A. C. Warren of Holy Trinity Vicarage, Cambridge, tried the experiment of printing privately. 'Two years ago I tried the experiment of publishing privately for the use of my own congregation some short pamphlets designed to explain the Church Services so that people might find in them a deeper reality.' These proved very useful, and in the light of suggestions made by others the pamphlets have been redrafted and made available generally. They may be obtained from Messrs. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge, price 1d. per copy. They explain *Morning and Evening Prayer, The Psalms, The Creed, Hymns in Church, Worship in Church, Common Prayer, and Praying Altogether*. They are so cheap that we would suggest that one or two copies be bought to see if they will not fill a real want.

New Testament Economics, by Mr. John Hedley Higginson, B.Sc. (published by the author, 36 Cavendish Road, Sutton, Surrey; 2s. 3d.), is written to rebut the arguments of those who would claim Jesus as an opponent of the present economic system. The writer does not go very deeply into the matter, but he has little difficulty in showing that texts from the Gospels which have been quoted in support of some socialistic system have no such meaning, and that our Lord while condemning covetousness and uttering the gravest warnings against the danger of riches, has nothing to say against private property or the transaction of the ordinary business and commerce of the world. 'The fact is, that whilst Jesus condemned outright covetousness and Mammon-worship, and was ever the champion of the weak and the oppressed, His essential teaching concerning wealth is that of Stewardship.'

Some years ago the Rev. T. Walker, M.A., then a missionary in India, wrote a series of studies in

the Book of Acts under the title of *Missionary Ideals*. These have now been republished by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship (1s. net) and are intended primarily for use in study circles. The work is carefully done, and not only exhibits the missionary ideals of the Apostolic Church but throws a good deal of light on the Acts of the Apostles from parallel experiences in the modern mission field. The book fully deserves a new lease of life.

The Revival of the Reformed Faith, by Professor D. M. Maclean, D.D., is number four of the Inter-Varsity Theological Papers (Inter-Varsity Fellowship; 6d. net). These papers are informative and timely, not least the present one. But we regret the sharpness of tone which enters into them. If men's minds are turning with increasing appreciation to Calvin and the Reformed Faith that can surely be discussed without vague and wholesale condemnations of Higher Criticism and Modernism. Karl Barth, who is here lauded as the prophet of this revival, is a higher critic, and so for that matter is Professor Maclean himself. As an evidence of the crude materialism which once prevailed he refers to a prayer he heard from 'a callow and irreverent theological student.' The incident happened forty years ago and had not the significance here attributed to it. By a curious coincidence the reviewer was present as well as the author, and he can certify that though the student may have been callow, irreverence was not in all his thoughts.

We are glad to note that 'The Westminster Version' of the New Testament is being issued in a second edition. We have received *The New Testament*, Vol. I. *The Synoptic Gospels*, by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Joseph Dean, D.D., Ph.D. (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net). The Version is an admirable translation from the Greek. The Introduction is brief but pointed, and Protestant scholars are freely quoted. It is in form a very handsome volume, beautifully printed on good paper and well bound. We note that this volume I. is really the last to be published, so that all four volumes of this edition are now available. Cordially we wish the undertaking all success.

The Sayings of Christ Collected and arranged from the Gospels, by Mr. J. W. Mackail, O.M., LL.D. (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net), is a reprint of a book originally published in 1894 and re-issued in a revised form in 1917 for use among the soldiers in France, where it was extensively circulated. It

contains the sayings of Jesus arranged under such headings as the New Law, the Cost of Service, the Son of God, the Everlasting Gospel, etc. Dr. Mackail's high standing as a scholar and literary critic is an ample guarantee that the arrangement is made with knowledge and taste.

We are glad to draw attention to the fact that Messrs. Macmillan have now issued a cheap edition at 7s. 6d. of *The Fullness of Sacrifice*, by the Rt. Rev. F. C. N. Hicks, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. This work appeared first in 1930 when a full notice appeared in this magazine showing its argument and scope.

Not only England but New Zealand also has its Keswick. Mr. J. Oswald Sanders, the Superintendent of the New Zealand Bible Training Institute, has now published a selection of addresses which he gave at seven of the New Zealand Conventions: *Christ Indwelling and Enthroned*. They are published in this country by Messrs. Marshall, Morgan & Scott at 2s. 6d. net. They seem to us to embody the Keswick message in a very full way.

'Seldom, if ever before, have there been gathered together in so small a compass as in the pages of this book, such a helpful exposition of "the place and power of faith in the world to-day,"' is pretty good for the jacket of a book called *Faith in Action: A Challenge to Christian People*, edited by the Rev. T. Wilkinson Riddle, F.R.S.L., D.D. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 1s. net). It is irritating to the most saintly reviewer to find both exaggeration and bad grammar in such a puff. The addresses printed here are quite good. They were delivered at the Mildmay Conference of April, 1938, by various people, well known like Miss Mildred Cable, 'The Maréchale,' and Dr. Zwemer, and others not so well known. They are on such subjects as Faith Defined, Faith Confirmed, Faith and Prayer, Faith and Guidance, and similar themes. Readers will be edified and inspired by the words printed here, which, if not unique, are earnest and helpful.

It has been well said that 'Saint Augustine is probably the greatest, after Saint Paul and the other canonical writers, of all those whose written work has been wholly or largely devoted to the defence and propagation of the Christian religion, the greatest, not only in the supreme power of his unique personality, but also in the nature and extent of his influence upon Christian thought.' A monograph of high merit has been published by

the Oxford University Press, entitled *Saint Augustine and French Classical Thought*, by Professor Nigel Abercrombie, M.A., D.Phil. (10s. 6d. net). The writer is manifestly a profound student of Augustine and his system. In the first of four essays he discusses the moral philosophy of Augustine. In the next three he deals with the indebtedness to Augustine of Montaigne, Descartes, and Pascal. The work is admirably done, with a French lucidity about it, and it throws many interesting side-lights upon the thought and influence of the great father of the Church.

The Rhoenbruderhof was dissolved by German authority and its members expelled from Germany because 'a pacifist and international community was not wanted in Germany.' The members have settled down among the Cotswolds, and have established 'The Cotswold Bruderhof Press' there. They publish a magazine called *The Plough. Towards the Coming Order*. The first book published by the Press is before us—*The Individual and World Need*, by Mr. Eberhard Arnold, one of the expelled members. It is a beautiful meditation on Christian lines, and full of the spirit of the gospel. The current number of *The Plough* has been sent with Mr. Arnold's book. It is chiefly notable for an article by Mr. Middleton Murry, criticising rather adversely the central principle of the brotherhood. He is an admirer both of the brotherhood and of Mr. Arnold, and it says much for the sincerity and courage on both sides that the article was written and is published. The price of Mr. Arnold's book is 3s.

It is increasingly recognized that the Church's young people must receive in the Bible class much more systematic teaching than has often been given, that they must be shown the identity of the Church throughout the ages and the relevance of Bible teaching to the problems of to-day. The S.P.C.K. has been issuing a Bible-class series along these lines. The third volume is *Power and Witness*, edited by the Rev. J. R. Lumb, M.A. (2s. 6d. net). It is arranged in seven sections, each containing four or five lessons. These sections begin with the witness of Jeremiah and of St. Paul, and lead on through a study of the Creed to lessons on six great modern evangelists. The whole conception and plan is admirable and should make an excellent text book for Bible-class leaders.

A biography of *Frances Mary Buss*, pioneer in women's education, has been written by Sara A. Burstall, M.A., LL.D. (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net).

It would be difficult to find any one better qualified to write of Miss Buss, for Miss Burstall's recollections go back to 1871 when she was one of her pupils. From 1881 she was Miss Buss's assistant mistress, and was trained by her for headships. This memoir, short though it is, gives not only all the necessary facts but shows clearly and convincingly the ideas behind the work that Miss Buss did. In girlhood she wrote 'Why are women so little thought of? I want girls educated to match their brothers.' Later on she was specially animated by the desire to prevent for the next generation the suffering that came to untrained women who in later life were obliged to depend on their own efforts for support. 'But as I have grown older the terrible sufferings of the women of my own class for want of good elementary training have more than ever intensified my desire to lighten, ever so little, the misery of women brought up to be married and taken care of, but left alone in the world destitute. It is impossible for words to express my fixed determination of alleviating this evil.'

One of the aims of good Bible teachers must be realism. The ordinary child regards the Bible characters and places as belonging to a vague, almost ghost world. They are not real, like Poplar or Chamberlain. And the teacher has to get over to the child the fact that Abraham, Moses, and Paul were as real as Chamberlain, and Nazareth as real as Poplar. *Modern Illustrations of the Gospels*, by Mr. P. C. Sands, M.A., Headmaster of Pocklington School (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net), will help in this laudable effort. The title indicates the nature of the contents. Sayings of our Lord are illustrated by parallels in modern life, and aspects of Christian life are similarly illuminated. The illustrations are well chosen and really interesting. Clergymen will not be above making use of such good stuff.

The Bible: What it is and what is in it, by the Rev. E. Evans, B.D., and Professor T. H. Robinson, Litt.D., D.D., D.Th. (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net), is a book about the Bible for the general use of African Christians. It was commissioned by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and in the course of the enterprise it was suggested that the value of the book would be increased if the language used was Basic English. The writers had no knowledge of this. Neither have we. But with the help of the Orthological Institute, the book was purged of all that was not Basic. We judge from the result that Basic English is simply good, plain, simple English, and that is what is used.

The book consists to begin with of several essays on 'Revelation and Development' (very good), 'The Geography of Palestine,' 'The History of Israel' (a masterly survey), 'The Religion of the Bible' (able but rather complex in some of its parts. We cannot imagine the simple African Christian taking it all in), 'The Bible: What it is and How it was put into Writing' (simple and useful). We have then a long section on 'The Books of the Bible,' consisting of an analysis of their contents. This is one of the most helpful parts of the book, and will greatly assist the simple reader, or indeed any kind of reader. The last section is on 'The Teaching of the Bible.' It will be apparent that this is a book which will be very enlightening as an introduction to the study of the Scriptures. Its standpoint is modern, and it may be looked on as an effort to present the Bible and its revelation in the light of the best scholarship and from the modern standpoint. It is meant for African Christians, but it ought to be widely circulated among ourselves. For teachers both in Day and Sunday Schools this work will prove a boon. It would be difficult to point to anything like it. And the incredible price is half a crown.

A very interesting book has been issued for 'The Church Historical Society' by Mr. A. W. Wade-Evans. It is *Nennius's History of the Britons* together with *The Annals of the Britons and Court Pedigrees of Hywel the Good*, also *The Story of the Loss of Britain* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). A scholarly introduction is prefaced in which Mr. Wade-Evans indicates the relationships of those early documents, and gives hints as to their value. 'The Loss of Britain,' it is easy to see, is often far from credible owing to its confusions. But it is the basis on which Nennius and many others built. So early confusion was crystallized into tradition which was repeated in chronicle after chronicle. All interested in the early history of Britain will find Mr. Wade-Evan's edition of Nennius indispensable.

Four Broadcast talks and a sermon preached in Cambridge University have been published by Dom Bernard Clements, O.S.B., under the title *Learning to be a Christian* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). The sermon is on 'Every Idle Word.' Included is another Broadcast address on 'The Meaning of Holy Week.' The group from which the little book takes its name deals with 'Making Enquiries,' 'Making Experiments,' 'Learning from God,' 'Learning from other Christians.' Dom Clements has a style and a mode of approach all his own. It sounds so elementary at first, and then you

perceive how fallacious that judgment is. By a most interesting path he leads us right to the heart of a big problem. For a certain type of young person we can imagine nothing better than the line of argument here worked out.

We have book clubs of the left and of the right. Some of us do not care to have our reading prescribed to us, but the system is undoubtedly popular and the terms offered are very tempting. The latest is the S.C.M. Religious Book Club which has already a membership approaching twenty thousand. Eight volumes have been published at two shillings each for members. The one before us—*Biology and Christian Belief*, by Mr. William Osborne Greenwood, M.D., B.S., F.R.S.E. (5s. net)—provides good solid reading, both informative and interesting. The writer ranges through wider fields than merely the biological. His survey begins with physics and leads on to psychology and psychic research, and he shows himself to be well informed and thoroughly up-to-date. On the religious side he does not show quite the same competence. His chapter on Immortality is the weakest in the book, and he hardly takes the Christian standpoint when he says that 'the difference between natural and revealed has largely melted and the two are much more closely merged into one.' Like so many modern writers he does not clearly distinguish between religious and specifically Christian belief. But taken all in all it is a very excellent and helpful work.

Hero-worship is an essential part of the education of the young, and many young Christian hearts have been fired by reading of the heroic deeds done and the heroic lives lived for Christ's sake. *Heroes of the Faith*, by Mr. Henry Cook (S.C.M.; 5s. net), is a book to put into the hands of the young and of those who teach them. Its aim is to give some account of great figures in the history of the Church and of the conditions under which they lived and gave their witness. The heroes are arranged in four groups of seven, Early Martyrs, Early Missionaries, Teachers, and Saints. The record given of each is necessarily brief, but it is interesting enough to quicken a desire for fuller knowledge. Bible-class teachers will find here a great deal of excellent material for talks.

Mr. S. V. Benson has prepared a small book on the virtue of charity (Warne & Co.; 1s. net). The title is *The Greatest of These*, the anthology taking the attractive form of readings for thirty-one days.

Problems of To-day.

IV. The Church and the Child.

BY THE REVEREND F. J. RAE, D.D., DIRECTOR OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION,
ABERDEEN TRAINING CENTRE FOR TEACHERS.

DR. RUSK, lecturer in Education at Glasgow University, in his little book on *Religious Education*, writes: 'It is the child in the midst we have to consider, and it is the neglect of this factor that is almost unanimously regarded by professional educationists as the reason for the failure of religious education.' That is the contention of this article. And it may be pointed out, to begin with, that it is the discovery of the child that has transformed modern education, both religious and secular. Up till recently the aim and method of education were determined by its material. That is to say, there was a certain amount of knowledge to be imparted to the child, and (certainly in the case of religious education) this was given to him irrespective of his capacity or fitness to receive it. The 'facts' in the Bible were taught, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Acts, chronologically and on no other principle. The sacrifice of Isaac and the slaughter of the Canaanites by divine command were taken by the teacher in his stride without much regard to the age of the child. But once it was seen that education must be child-centred, and that age and capacity must determine both method and material, a new realism was brought into education. The syllabus of instruction was reconstructed, and the whole scheme was fitted to the developing mind of the child. That by way of introduction. It will serve to make way for my first point.

1. *The Importance of the Child.* 'It is the child in the midst we have to consider.' It is true that consideration of the child has radically transfigured modern education. But it ought to do more than that. The problem of the child is vitally urgent for all of us, lay and clerical. For one thing the future of the world depends on the child. The average citizen, even the most thoughtless, has recently been forced to consider the state of the world. Is it to be ruled by force? Is there any prospect of the spread of a spirit of reconciliation? What likelihood is there of a permanent peace? What chance have moral and spiritual factors of shaping the future? I do not think any one will deny that these questions will be answered by the motives and ideals dominating the education of the child,

and especially his religious education. And if we withdraw our gaze from the far horizon, and think of the problems of the State, the importance of the child for to-morrow is seen to be at least as urgent. All sorts of ugly facts have to be dealt with—unemployment, housing, poverty, gambling, and the materialism that is lowering the ideals and the tone of multitudes. And, beyond these facts, there is the question of the whole shape our political and social system is to take in the next generation. Is the truth that is in Socialism to be wrought into our body politic? Or, at any rate, is the basis of our national life to be Christianized. These are profoundly urgent facts and problems, and how are they to be dealt with in any conclusive manner but by the spirit of Christ? And how is the new generation to face them and solve them unless it is itself Christianized? It is the child in the midst we have to consider.

And finally, if the child is important for the world and the State, he is as important for the *Church*. It is surely obvious that not merely the size of the Church, not merely her welfare, not merely the future of her home and foreign missions, but her very *existence* depends on how she deals with the child in the midst, on whether she can hold and keep him.

Let me point out one or two menacing facts about the present religious situation. My figures refer to Scotland, since it is with these I am most familiar. But there is every reason to believe that the situation is at least as bad in England. Take three outstanding facts. There is first the large multitude outside the Church altogether. 'A survey of the relations between the Church and the youth of Scotland to-day,' writes one who is a well-known church leader, 'reveals a dangerous state of affairs. In proportion to the adult membership of the Church of Scotland, her adolescent adherents are only fifty per cent. of what might be expected, and the contact of many of these is little more than nominal. Equally disturbing is the fact that more than one half of the whole adult population of Scotland has no contact with any form of organized religion. The decline in our Bible class membership in recent years is greater than any decline in

population can explain. During the past few years it is evident that the drift away from the churches has begun to affect the children also. In certain areas which have been investigated it has been found that over thirty per cent. of children from nine to fourteen are outside Sunday schools' (from 'A Survey of the Work of the Youth and Education Department' given at a conference of Youth Conveners in June 1938). It may be added that in a county independently investigated twenty-five per cent. of the children attending the day school were found to have no Church or Sunday school connexion.

So much for the outsiders. Consider next an ominous fact, the leakage that goes steadily on. There is a continual drift away from the Church of those who were in its Sunday schools. It is difficult to furnish any reliable account of the extent of this drift. I have heard it put by one who has given special attention to the problem as high as thirty per cent. I do not offer this as authoritative. But of the reality of the drift and its seriousness there can be no doubt. We had these people under our care and instruction—why have we lost them? We hear a good deal about the Home Mission problem, and how to deal with it. But is not the Home Mission problem *created* by this leakage? These outsiders are the problem, and it is surely clear that if we could stop the leakage the size of the problem would steadily diminish.

And finally, to add one more depressing fact, there is the continuous decline in the numbers attending both Church schools and Bible classes. I have been furnished with an elaborate table of statistics on this matter, but I will not burden the reader with too much detail. Let me give broad conclusions. From 1936 to 1937 there was in the Church of Scotland a decline in Sunday schools of 41, of scholars of 5053, of teachers of 78, and of Bible class members of 576. It is stated definitely that in 1936 there were 566 congregations without any Bible class, and in 1937 this deficiency was increased by ten. The figures refer to the Church of Scotland. They seem at first sight incredible. But they are given on the authority of the official report of its Youth Committee. The facts are even more serious when a number of years is examined. Over a period of three years there was a decline of over twenty thousand Sunday school scholars and seventy-six schools.

We may soften the shock of these facts when we reflect that unemployment, poverty, and similar social factors may to some extent account for them. We may also reflect that the Church has

often been in much, very much, lower water. A hundred years ago things were at a low ebb in the religious world. And fifty years ago, when I was a student, the religious atmosphere was frigid, and a fierce secularist movement attracted many adherents. But, soften the impact of such facts as we may, they are very serious. And they serve at least to emphasize the importance of the child for the future of the Church. How can we win and hold the youth of our land?

But a question that presses on my own mind is this: Is the importance of the child recognized? I have pointed out that it has been recognized by educationists. It may be admitted that in recent years it has been recognized by the State. The child receives free education. Its health is attended to. There are child-welfare centres, and even the pre-natal child is cared for. On the whole, the State does its duty by the child, except in one particular—it entirely neglects the soul of the child. I cannot but regard it as an absurd anomaly that, while the State subsidizes Church day schools which have a denominational character, in its own national schools it only *permits* religious education. By 'use and wont' religious education is given in all State schools in Scotland, but it is not officially recognized as an essential thing; and teachers in the training colleges are not trained by the government or at public expense to give religious education. This training is given by the Church, and it has a recognized place by law in all government training colleges. But it is provided and paid for solely by the Church of Scotland.

But is the importance of the child recognized by the Church itself? It is impossible to answer this question simply in the negative. For many congregations have school and Bible class, many have Boys' Brigade or Scout troop, Girls' Guildry, Girl Guides, and other youth organizations. Besides this, the churches all have central committees concerned with youth, and these committees often do very valuable work, by their literature, by their field agents, by Conferences and Summer Schools held to make work among young people more efficient. There is a great deal of this kind of work that is well conceived and well done. I should like to pay a tribute to the really fine service such youth and education Church committees do. In addition to this the Church of Scotland has appointed, and supports, directors of religious education in all the government training colleges for teachers, who give to the future teachers a careful and well-considered training for the work of religious education in the schools.

But, when these facts are allowed for, I am left with a serious and growing conviction that the Church as a whole, and its leaders in particular, have not awakened to the real urgency of the problem before us. The great mass of people outside the Church is presented to us as a 'Home Mission Problem.' It is dealt with by evangelism and by schemes of Church extension. And no doubt we can and do win back a number in these ways. They deserve all the support we can give them. But are we not attacking the 'Home Mission Problem' at the wrong end? The right end is before it becomes a problem. There is a great company of outsiders, but the size of this company is being added to year by year through the drift away from the Church of a large number of young people who for one reason or another have left us. Should we not concentrate on the prevention of this leakage? I do not think that the Church can be regarded as taking the importance of the child seriously until the best brains in the Church are devoted to the questions: How are we to hold the child? How are we to stop this drift from the Church? I do not say that if we could answer these questions we should have disposed entirely of the problem of the outsider. But we should render it far less serious. And, if we were actually successful in stopping the leakage of young people from the Church, we should be in the way to making the Home Mission problem a manageable proposition.

I maintain that we are not giving to the question of the child's relation to the Church the *attention* it deserves, the concentrated, instructed, and whole-hearted consideration it requires. It is the child in the midst we have to *consider*. What is the attitude of the leaders of the Church, the men who shape its policy, who select the subjects to which the Church's mind should be directed? I am writing only of Scotland, and particularly of the Church of Scotland. But I should be surprised if what is true there, is not true elsewhere. And my impression of the general attitude of the administrative leaders is this. They are taken up with what they consider the big questions of Church life, how to discharge our duty to the new housing areas, how to stimulate interest in Foreign Missions, how to sustain the liberality of the Church for the maintenance of an effective ministry in every parish in Scotland. And these are all big matters. But our leaders have little time or thought left for the youth problem. That is handed over to a Youth Committee which certainly does not have the importance of most of the other Church bodies. It consists of, or contains, able and devoted men and women who are alive to the needs

of the situation. But they are regarded as amiable enthusiasts, and they are given their head up to a point. But they are not at all counted among the people who matter most. When their report comes before the General Assembly of the Scottish Church, it gets a place in the proceedings. But the leaders of the Church for the most part look on that occasion as the opportunity for an off-time. The youth enthusiasts are left to enthuse mainly by themselves.

I am insisting that the brains of the Church are not being given to this, the most vital problem before the Church to-day. And this neglect is mirrored in the situation all over the Church. In the Church of Scotland all the enterprises on which it is engaged are supported by the contributions of its members. And these are amazingly generous. But will it be credited that last year more than 500 congregations gave no financial support to the youth work whatever? It is in harmony with this fact that all over the Church the provision of facilities for Sunday school work is inadequate. If the Church regarded this work as its primary concern the congregations would provide buildings suitable for class work. But it is far from being the case. We are very much concerned with the beauty and comfort of our churches. But in many cases we think it of small moment that the buildings in which our children are being trained in the knowledge of God and His Word should be beautiful and suited to their purpose. Yet it is far more important that the school should be in every way fitted for its need than that the church should be.

In what I have written I have discharged my soul of a conviction which I think it is important for some one to state in set terms, that the Church to-day is not sufficiently alive to the fact that the child is her real problem, and to the duty of devoting her best and most serious thought to the issues that are raised by his relation to her fellowship, and I conclude by offering some positive suggestions for the solution of the problem.

2. *A Positive Policy.* (1) At the risk of being tedious I would insist to begin with that the Church must realize that the problem of the child is behind *all* other problems—Home Mission, Foreign Mission, Finance, and all the rest. This will be obvious as a mere statement. But it is simply not seen. All these big causes are presented to the Church for her support, and presented ably and persistently by influential people and on favourable occasions. Crowded assemblies consider them. But the child is relegated to a very subordinate place; we must change this orientation. If in our Assemblies and in our Church policy we had the child in the fore-

ground we should have greater hope of solving the problems he raises. The Church must awaken to the size of this issue, to its vital importance for her own existence, before we can achieve what is needful.

(2) What above all is necessary to deal with the situation created by the facts of leakage and decline in numbers is a *system*. We must have a considered scheme by which we can keep our hand on every child from his birth till the day on which he sits down at the Lord's Table. There must be a ladder from the Font to the Holy Table over which every child will be conducted. The essentials of such a scheme are pastoral care and systematic training. Let us look at these two points. From the time when a child is written down in the Church record as a baptized infant he should be the subject of careful and loving attention. When he comes to the age of fourteen and is ready to leave the Sunday school, what happens? It is then the drift takes place. There is a gap between the Sunday school and what is called in Scotland the 'Bible class.' This gap is filled by what is called the 'Junior Bible class,' which is conducted by a lay person, not always qualified to deal with boys and girls at such a critical age. Obviously this is a stage which demands the most expert teaching and the most attractive teacher. It does not always get these. But it is not merely the lack of these that accounts for the beginning of the leak at this time. It is mainly the lack of personal care. The boy or girl drifts away and is not visited. These young people are lost sight of for want of persistent and kindly interest in their welfare. If a book were kept with the record of every child in a congregation, and each stage of his Church career were noted, and, at the critical time referred to above, he was if necessary visited with a personal invitation to continue in the minister's own class, we should have far more success in stopping the drift.

But, what is of equal importance, I most earnestly maintain that there should be no 'gap' between the training in the Sunday school and the further training in the minister's class. The child should pass from the Sunday school to the minister's class at once, for the latter should take these youths at fourteen or fifteen and train them for confirmation. It is the minister's business to take the adolescent boys and girls at the most difficult and critical time of their lives. It is his great opportunity. And, speaking generally, he alone can hold them and give them the necessary training. It is painful to read of 'Bible' classes at which addresses are given on the religious teaching of Browning and other

literary lights, and to which people of all ages from sixteen to sixty are invited, when the youth of sensitive and enquiring age is crying out for attention and guidance, for knowledge of the Bible and of the Christian faith, and for personal Christian friendship. Our young people are woefully and incredibly ignorant of the Bible and of the grounds of Christian belief. And they are for the most part very ready to respond to the approach of a friendly and human minister. In our present system, or lack of system, these are often lamentably absent, not always due to any fault of the ministry, but simply to the fact that we have not thought out an intelligent system by which we can hold the youth at the time when he is apt to disappear quietly from our ken. In what I have written I have had the Scottish Church in my mind. But, *mutatis mutandis*, everything applies with a slightly altered angle to Episcopalian churches as well. At least the main elements do.

(3) I have said nothing of the training given in our Sunday schools. That is obviously of great importance. For if we do not succeed in giving the children a love of the Bible and of Jesus Christ at this early stage, it will be much more difficult to do this later on. The work done in our Sunday schools by many devoted teachers must be gratefully acknowledged. That work, when backed by personal piety and character, has in the past exercised a profound influence and borne gracious fruits. And let it be said that the chief qualification for such work is just these personal qualities. But we are living in an age when something more is required in our Church schools. The children know what skilled teaching is. They get it in the day school. And it is unfortunate when the children are led to compare the teaching in the one school with that in the other. It seems to me then an indispensable measure that our teachers in the Sunday schools should receive a training that is at least sufficient for the purpose. A training class has become a necessary element in our Church educational system. At such a class the inexperienced teacher will learn how to give a lesson, how to deal with his difficulties, how to gain attention, how to interest the child. He will have the opportunity of stating his own problems and learning how others are facing them. For want of this kind of training many of our Sunday schools are inefficient, and the aim of the school is unrealized. It would amply reward individual congregations if they would send their teachers from time to time to one of the Summer Schools or Conferences that are held under the auspices of the Church or those of the National Sunday School Union. The teachers

would come back with new enthusiasm, and also with new knowledge of how to tackle their work.

But this is not enough. I venture to say that the main function of our Sunday schools is to teach and foster the spirit of worship. And this is where the need of reform, or at least improvement, is most clamant. The child is a born ritualist. Truth comes to him through symbol. And he is very sensitive to form and ceremony. And in any case he will react to worship that is his own. I plead therefore for worship in the Sunday school that is beautiful, simple, brief, and reverent, for worship in which the child can take audible part, that is concerned about his own needs and expressed in words he would use. I plead for prayers that are considered and to which he can respond in brief sentences. The Church school is a glorious opportunity for training children in the art and in the spirit of true worship. This is often enough absent in our congregational services. And the casual attitude of many Church people to public prayer is an inheritance from the Sunday school of the past. There are admirable examples of simple responsive services for Church school worship to be had. And it would be a great service to the religious life of our land if something on these lines were used by the leaders of our schools.

(4) And now, finally, there is something that needs to be done in our theological colleges for the training of our ministers. We in Scotland have always been proud of the thorough theological training our

ministers receive. They are taught Hebrew and Greek, Church History and Dogmatics, and I am far from suggesting that anything less should be demanded. A minister without a background of theology will soon come to an end of his resources, and his preaching will show this. There is also a course on 'Practical Training,' which includes 'pedagogics.' But this is only one subject among many in the course; it is not given by an expert, and it is wholly insufficient to meet the need. A young minister is settled in a parish after his years of preparation. How is he fitted to deal with the work among the young? How is he to organize it? How is he to train his school staff in the way, or ways, to teach? Is he sent into his parish with the conviction that the children are his main objective? Not his sermons, or his administration, or even his visiting, not any of them is his main business, but how to see that these young people are trained to know and love their Bible, to love the Church and feel at home in it, to love the Lord Jesus Christ and to rejoice in the worship of God. Does he realize that it is the child in the midst he has to 'consider'? If this is his great task, then to fit him for it should be one of the main functions of a theological college which aims at the training of the clergy. And we can never be satisfied, this work will never be adequately done, until we have in all our colleges a professor who is an expert in this work, and whose sole duty it will be to send men into our parishes furnished for it.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Traveller's Tale.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,
LISBON.

'Made in the likeness of men.'—Ph 2⁷.

In the year 1295 three men in outlandish and travel-worn garments appeared in Venice. They were Maffeo and Nicolo Polo and Nicolo's son Marco. They had been, they said, travelling for twenty years in China, the land of the great Emperor Kublai Khan, and they had many marvellous travellers' tales to tell.

At first nobody believed them, but when they

slit open the seams of their coats and poured out quantities of precious stones, people did believe them, and Venice did them great honour. Afterwards, Marco Polo was taken prisoner at sea, and in prison at Genoa he wrote the book of his travels of which you can read to-day, if you like; or you can go to see him in the cinema, for they have now made a film about Marco Polo.

I don't know what happened to the jewels he brought home with him from the Far East; they are long since vanished. But there is one jewel he brought back which shines as brightly as ever in his book. It is not a diamond or a ruby—it is a legend.

He heard it at a town in the neighbourhood from

which the Three Wise Men are believed to have come who followed the Star to Bethlehem bringing their gifts to Jesus.

The legend says they were a young man, a man of middle-age, and an old man. When they came to Bethlehem, the young man went in first, and when he came out the others asked him, 'What is He like?' The answer was, 'He is a young man.'

The man in middle-age went in next; and when he came out the others asked him, 'What is He like?' The answer was, 'He is a man of middle-age.'

The old man then went in, and when he came out the other two asked him the same question. The answer was, 'He is an old man.'

That is the first part of the legend.

Now what is a legend? It isn't history. It is not something that is, as we say, 'literally' true. But it may be true for all that. It is a way of telling something that is really true. We know Jesus couldn't be at the same time, a young man, a middle-aged man, and an old man. He was, in fact, a little baby in His mother's arms. What, then, does the story mean?

Just this. Three men were looking for a Saviour. Each wanted a Saviour who could understand the difficulties and temptations that belonged to his own age, and each felt he had found in Jesus just what he needed. The young man found a young man's Saviour; the middle-aged man found the Saviour for middle-age, and the old man a Saviour for old age.

Now this is true! Jesus isn't only the Saviour of the young or the old; He is for all ages and every age. He understands the young, the middle-aged, the old. He knows what children think and feel, and what their troubles are; He understands the old, and can help both—'He is,' the Bible says, 'the Saviour of *all* men.' He is just the Saviour you need and can help you as no one else can. You don't need to wait till you are older to come to Him. He is the Saviour you need now; when you grow older He will be the Saviour you need then; and when you are very old you will still find the answer to your needs in Him. You can begin to sing now—

Thou, O Christ, art all I want;
More than all in Thee I find—

and whether it is a child's strong voice, or a young man's strong voice, or an old man's shaking voice that sings it, it is equally true for all.

That is the first part of the legend, and the truth

of it you can prove for yourself; and I hope you will.

Here, now, is the second part. What did these three wise men do? They might have argued about it and got hot and angry, each saying, 'I'm right and therefore you must be wrong.' They might even have fought about it, as men have argued and quarrelled and fought about their different ideas of Christ. They did none of these things, which shows that they deserved to be called 'wise men.' They listened to each other's account, and then they said, 'Let us go in together and see Him'; and, the legend says, 'When they went in together they saw Him as He really was!'

This also is true. Christians are divided. All are sure they are right and everybody else is wrong. They all have their own ideas of Christ and Christianity, what the Church is and what is the way to worship. If they would all go together to Christ, they would see Him as He really is, and each other more kindly.

The nations are divided. They call themselves Christian, and the Christian nations have all some right to the title. But each is sure it's right, and what it wants is right, and the others are wrong. So we are all anxious and haunted by the fear of war. All that would come to a happy end, if, instead of conferences with each other, sulky and suspicious, all would go together to Bethlehem and confer with the Lord Jesus. They would see the Prince of Peace, the Saviour all the world needs.

But that is for the world, and the world is slow to change. You and I are not the world but just 'us'—and the certain thing is that Jesus Christ is the Saviour for us—exactly what we need.

A Pick-a-back.

BY THE REVEREND C. M. HEPBURN, B.D.,
MOULIN, PITLOCHRY.

'In all their affliction he was afflicted . . . he bare them, and carried them all the days of old.'—Is 63^o.

I saw two aeroplanes a short time ago. I dare say there seems nothing unusual in that. It so happens, however, that these are the only two of their kind in the world. They were 'moored' in the River Tay and are known as the Mayo composite aircraft. It was invented by a Major Mayo. The larger seaplane or mother plane is called *Maia*. *Maia* was a Greek goddess. The little one is called *Mercury*. *Mercury* was *Maia*'s son. I expect we have all seen pictures of him as the god of speed with two wings on his helmet. *Maia* is so large and strong that

the little plane *Mercury* can sit on its back. At the start of a flight they are firmly fixed together in that fashion. As soon as their eight propellers revolve (each of the planes is equipped with four), they skim over the water and rise from it still as one. Once they are speeding through the air the pilot of *Maia* asks *Mercury's* pilot up above him whether he is ready. And when the answer comes back, 'I'm ready,' *Maia's* pilot replies, 'One—two—three—go!' pulls a lever and releases *Mercury*, which is then left to fly on alone, while the mother boat *Maia* flies back to its base, its part now done. But *Mercury*, the pick-a-back plane, couldn't have risen without *Maia's* help, for the cargo it carries is too much for its strength unless assisted.

Is there not a thought for us here? In a sense we also can sometimes give other persons a pick-a-back. I mean it's the duty of the strong to support the weak. It is truly a Christian thing to give those who are less able a lift. In the East End of London not long ago, at a place called the People's Palace, a party was given to which many poor children were invited. It was sad to see how hungry some of them were. One very small fellow, after tucking in for all he was worth, when the time came to go home again, turned to his bigger brother and said, 'Bill, carry me home, but please don't bend me.' And brother Bill, hoisting him up, nobly gave him a pick-a-back home. In like manner we are told in God's Word to share the loads of others. It says, 'Bear ye one another's burdens.' Are you willing then to do that?

It is wise now, again to remember this. Some day we may be burdened ourselves and may require to be raised up and to be borne on God's strong shoulders. Ah, but can God and will God bear us up? Our Bible assures us He can and He will. A mother eagle, so it says, when she is training her eaglet to fly, will swoop underneath it when it begins to be faint and tired and give it a pick-a-back on her wings awhile till it is strong enough to try again. And God does so, too, the Bible declares. Besides, people who have trusted Him have often proved that that is His way. Good Pastor Niemöller, who is imprisoned in Germany, wrote in a brave letter not long ago, 'I am trusting in Him whom I have served to carry me now.' And he hasn't been disappointed. Or Sir Ernest Shackleton, the great explorer, said he had no doubt Providence 'carried' them, when he and his friends were braving the dangers of the far Antarctic. God doesn't fail those who rely upon Him, for 'He bare them, and carried them all the days of old.' God is near us always, close at hand to help and to save. So

trust Him should you be in need and He will surely carry you, too.

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Obedience in the Christian Life.

'Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life.'—Jn 14⁶.

Once when our Lord was teaching in some city or village, a casual hearer in the crowd accosted Him with the question: 'Lord, are there few that be saved?' He may have been merely curious, or he may have felt the weight of mystery which hangs over our mortal life, and thought that if some hand would draw aside, even for a moment, the veil which hides eternity from us, it would help him to believe. Be that as it may, our Lord did not answer the man's question. He only said, speaking to His hearers generally: 'Strive all of you to enter in at the strait gate.' It is as if He said to us: obedience, not knowledge, is the way to life. Lay down your sins, and give your life to God. *The one thing which will solve your ultimate questions is the thing which at the same time brings your soul to God.*

How vividly this truth concerning obedience writes itself over the text of Holy Scripture! In the wonderful thirty-third chapter of Exodus we hear of Moses in the wilderness going out to the Tabernacle in order to be alone with God, and how, as his impressive figure passed through the camp, the men of Israel stood in their tent-doors and followed him with their eyes. Moses is fain to have the secrets of the future disclosed, and God's ultimate design for Israel explained to him, and that cannot be. Comes the answer: 'My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest.' In other words, Moses, if he obeys God, will have the certitude that God is with him, and with this he must be content. Man cannot go before God, or see the end from the beginning, or get beyond all mystery. Again, we read of Elijah petulantly abandoning his task in Israel, and flinging himself into the desert spaces that in their solitudes he might recover his lost assurance of God. But the result is not as he expected. Not in miraculous outward epiphanies, as he supposed, does the Lord reveal Himself even at Horeb, but in the moral imperative of duty, the still voice that bids him return and take up his forsaken task. We need not wonder, therefore, that these two Old Testament figures, who learned obedience by the

things they suffered, stand by the side of Jesus in the Christian vision of the Transfiguration. For it is by His obedience unto death, by His acceptance of the Father's will that Jesus is transfigured, and He summons us to a share in His own life of obedience, and only as we thus accept Him as *the Way*, does He hold out to us the promise that we shall attain to truth and to life.

The conception of the Christian life as a directed life, a life of fellowship with Jesus Christ in His obedience, is not perhaps congenial in an age which, on the one hand, is sharply conscious of a great element of mystery in human affairs, and, on the other hand, is resentful of restrictions being put on the free self-development of the individual. How, when so much around us is hidden from our eyes, can we pretend to know the way to God? It is overlooked in this matter that science as well as religion depends upon patient, obedient, step-by-step resolution to act upon the truths which have been already attained to; that all advance, all discovery, comes by doing what Columbus did on his ever-memorable voyage when day by day he wrote in his log-book: 'This day we held Westward which was our course!'

A more serious challenge to Christianity in the modern world is the frank acceptance by many minds of pagan standards of the moral life. Men wish to have salvation by liberty or self-realization. Novelists and essay-writers are attacking the foundations of the Christian ethic as it bears on the family, on marriage, on sex-relations, and generally on the whole conception of the disciplined life. Why Christ, and His strict rule of obedience, love, and holiness? The modern mind does not take kindly to the thought of a strait and narrow way to life. So, in place of the gospel of Christ, it offers us the gospel of Naturalism—trust your inborn instincts and desires; or the gospel of Humanism—believe in the free unfettered development of society. Some modern polities, the Fascist States, for example, have frankly adopted one or other form of the first of these doctrines. Others, the idealistic democracies of the day, have as frankly seized upon the second. And both these ways are opposed to the Christian conception of life, inasmuch as both are expressions of self-will, which base their hope upon something given in our existing nature, and which are, therefore, incapable of delivering us from that nature. Neither, therefore, is a gospel of redemption.

It is here that we discover the real challenge of Christianity to the life of our day. Over against these modern doctrines or ideologies, which repose

their trust in powers or qualities which we already possess, *the gospel of Christ makes the demand and the offer of a new nature, a nature regenerated by love and self-sacrifice.* Christianity means the crossing out of our old nature by the communication of a new spirit. It calls us into the fellowship of Christ's obedience.

The Sermon on the Mount, which here rises before our minds, has created no little difficulty for thoughtful spirits in our time. How is it possible to reconcile the principle of not resisting evil and of loving enemies with the practical exigencies of life, social and international? When it is asked whether the Sermon on the Mount is, in its totality, practicable, we are in danger perhaps of overlooking a prior and even more urgent question. The first question which we need to ask concerns not what is possible for us, but what is the Will of God. *We have to ask whether anything less than what Jesus asks in the Sermon on the Mount can possibly be regarded as the Will of God.* Jesus was speaking to men who thought that they knew the Will of God, and who were complacent and satisfied! Had they not the Law, and did not the Law say, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy'? Over against this partial and imperfect understanding of the Will of God, Jesus will set that Will in all its uncompromising truth and purity.

This, then, is the first thing that the Sermon on the Mount does for us. It leads our souls—to God! *Jesus sets us face to face, not first with a rule of action—which we have not attained to, and can never fully attain to—but with a God whose perfect nature is at last declared, and on whose forgiveness and mercy and redeeming love, therefore, we are absolutely cast.* We can no more get away from this Will.

But this is not all. Face to face with the Sermon on the Mount, we see that we are also asked whether, recognizing as we now do, that our whole body, soul, and spirit are called up, claimed, and made dependent upon God, we are willing to place ourselves in His hands to do His will as far as in us lies. It is not a question of the amount of achievement, but of the quality of our spirit. The challenge of the teaching of Christ turns on whether we will make a beginning with His way of life, and so have our lives changed over into a new key.

Nor, in the end, is this a different thing from putting our trust in the Death of Christ for our sins. The 'Shall-be' of God which Jesus came to proclaim includes not only the announcement of a Divine ethic but the revelation of Divine forgive-

ness and Divine transforming power. So that we may say that to receive and follow the teaching of Jesus is at the same time to accept His passion, and to believe in His passion is at the same time to receive and follow His teaching. In actual Christian living the two things are not divided. In the reality of redemptive service Word and Cross are one.¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Jesus of Nazareth, King.

'The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever.'—Rev 11¹⁶.

What a note of triumph there is in the New Testament! The story of Jesus begins with the sons of angels crying, 'Peace on earth among the men of good will,' and ends with the Hallelujah Chorus sung by all the ransomed hosts of heaven. The New Testament writers not only teach as the climax to their story that Jesus is the ever near and available friend whose presence strengthens the will, deepens the love, and inspires the service of those who seek Him, but also they glory in the thought of Jesus risen, ascended, glorified, reigning.* They could not hold both those thoughts together in their minds, if they had supposed Jesus as sitting on the throne of God in some distant heaven beyond the sky. Their constant references to His reign and His exalted state are triumphant declarations that death could not hold Him, that the worst that evil could do fell away helpless, that His values were vindicated, His faith justified, and that His love had conquered all that hate and malevolence could do.

Side by side with the thought of the ever-present Christ, Paul glories in a Christ who sits in the heavenly places, 'far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come.' The New Testament writers realize that what has happened in their experience is no mere hole-and-corner affair which affects them alone. It is not as though they became friendly with one who lived a beautiful life, died a dreadful death, and with whom they were enabled to establish contact after death. What had happened was of infinite importance to the whole world, to all mankind, to every race, to each individual.

But we must pass from this attractive picture of Christ exalted and enthroned to ask whether that picture really represents reality. A preacher once

said that if St. Paul had turned East instead of West, Christ would never have conquered the Western world. But can anybody honestly say that Christ *has* conquered the Western world? We may, if we like, make comparisons with things that happen in the dark places of India, or Africa, or China, and find there convincing evidence of what His spirit has wrought in the West. His spirit has been the dynamic of a thousand philanthropies which never consciously acknowledge Him. His power brought into being many of the laws on our statute books. He has altered the name of the years, uplifted womanhood, given new dignity to manhood, made of paramount importance the lives of little children, made many evils disappear and made us ashamed of such evil as persists. The whole texture of our Western civilization would be reduced to a tattered rag if the threads He wove in Palestine were removed from it.

But let any man go into the slums of one of our great cities, say on a winter's Saturday night, slums in which men and women are herded together so that even one room is sometimes shared by more than one family; where men and women, to escape the intolerable conditions of those slums, so easily slip into drunkenness, immorality and vice, and such an observer will find it hard to say that Jesus reigns.

Or take our modern competitive business and industrial life with its antagonism that so seldom stays to see another's point of view, its restless, feverish quest to make money on the one hand, and to spend it on pleasure on the other, with its unscrupulous overriding of the rights of personality, its carelessness of spiritual things, and its pagan emphasis on selfishness, and ask whether we can say, 'Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory'?

Take our national and international life. All through it there are elements of bitter and unforgiving hostility. There is a so-called patriotism that is an enemy of the Kingdom of God, that cries that narrow and selfish cry, 'Ourselves alone,' and that has no intention of treating members of other nations as real brothers if there is any question of the sacrifice of profits or status: a refusal even to try out the principles of Jesus.

Are we then to dismiss this conception of a reigning Jesus? We must not let the idea go, though, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we must say, 'We see not yet all things subjected to him. But we behold . . . Jesus . . . crowned with glory and honour.'

Two reasons may be suggested why we must

¹ W. Manson, in *The Professor as Preacher*, 125.

keep the idea of the regnant Christ before us. The first is that when the evils we have mentioned are confronted with His power and His spirit they disappear. It is not as though we made a pessimistic list of the evils that curse the world, wringing our hands because we knew no cure for them. When we are bold enough to apply the solution implicit in the Christian revelation and attack them in Christ's name, we can overcome them. In the second place, we are so near these evils that their bulk obscures our vision. How feeble the Early Church must have seemed compared with the might of imperial Rome. Who could ever have supposed that that might would decrease and Christianity increase?

But what is the ground of our *certainty*? May it not be that the forces of materialism and selfishness may become too great, and Christianity become an effete and dead religion? We must base our certainty where the apostles based theirs: that, in Christ, God had spoken finally and completely and shown men His way of life. They believed that in Him are implicit the solutions of all human problems. 'I am ready to admit,' says Mr. Bernard Shaw in the Preface to *Androcles and the Lion*, 'that after contemplating the world and human nature for nearly sixty years I see no way out of the world's misery but the way which would have been found by Christ's will if He had undertaken the work of a modern practical statesman.' Indeed have we not tried every other way and found it to fail? Men are choosing Jesus rather than Barabbas, as Mr. Shaw points out in the same essay, not because they are in love with Jesus, but because Barabbas, for all his violent power and vulgar wealth, is such a gloomy failure.

In international relationships we are being pushed. In our industrial relationships we meet the same thing. In our individual life the same thing is true. Life will only work in God's way. We live in an age of revolt. 'Freedom!' is the cry. 'Let us have done with rules!' So people rush up this road of liberty and that. But men and women come back along those roads wherein so much was promised, disillusioned, heartbroken.

So when we look at life steadily it is as though internationally, socially, and individually, we had raced along a number of roads only to find at the end of them a strong iron paling with a large notice bearing the inscription, 'No Thoroughfare.' The king's way is the only way through.

Jesus reigns upon the throne of God! Does He? It depends on us how soon His Kingdom comes, on our abdication of the throne of our own

life in His favour. For the throne of God is the human heart.

Let us make as many contacts as we can with Him in prayer and fellowship and study and ask ourselves three questions: (1) Is there any way of practising this difficult art of living which offers more than His way? (2) Are we quite sure that the path we are following now is going to bring us out where, in our best moments, we want to be? (3) Is there any other way out of the unrest in which all the world is seething, to compare with the way which would open at once if Jesus reigned supremely in all men's hearts?

And we must begin with ourselves. No man can make a greater contribution to those great problems which distress us all in those days than in the silence of his own spirit to abdicate in favour of Christ, to surrender his whole being to Him; to let Christ dictate his every action and his every attitude, and, in the realm of his own life, to make Jesus King.¹

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Vows.

'I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all his people.'—Ps 116⁴.

It is perhaps one of the disquieting features of modern times that so many people pass through life without ever being called upon to make a really solemn and serious vow. It is a pity, for, rightly understood, in the making and keeping of vows there is focused the central problem of man's inner life and therefore most of the problems of his outer life as well. The making of a vow is a man's serious attempt to govern himself. A man's soul, some one has said, 'is as full of voices as a forest, and all the settlement and the sane government of his life consists in investing some of those voices with dignity and authority above all the rest.' You do that by a vow.

There are in a general way always two alternatives which lie before us in the conduct of life. One is to be carried along, in the main, by our instinctive natural wants and desires. We want money—of course we want money, who doesn't?—here's a chance to get some without trouble, let's take it, why not? Some one annoys us, we feel angry and 'let fly' at him, we are that man's enemy; some one flatters us, we 'purr,' we seek more of it, we are that man's friend. Or we like the preacher,

¹ L. D. Weatherhead, in *Sermons for the Year 1932*, 101.

we go to church ; we do not like him, so we stay away, and so on. Inclination, inclination !

What is the other alternative ? The other alternative is to attain a genuine personality. How ? Not by escaping from these instinctive wants—we cannot do that, of course—but by being able in principle to say ‘ No ! ’ to them all, yea, even, if need be, to that most passionate of all instincts which is the instinct to preserve our lives. There is no more tragic spectacle than merely instinctive human beings, human beings whose wills have never been thus released. And God’s call to the soul to absolute surrender, to a vowed obedience at any cost, is His first step to save it from that tragedy.

‘ I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all his people.’ Here are three not unimportant hints about vow-making.

First, vows should be made at the right time. ‘ I will pay my vows *now*.’ What then is the right time, the supreme ‘ now ’ for vow-making ? It is surely the time when for one reason or another there comes to you an unusual moment of higher vision and desire ; and you become aware of the greatness and seriousness of the issues of life, and the dignity of personal being that might be achieved by dealing with them in a great-hearted and serious way. Then and there, if you are wise, at that so swiftly passing ‘ now ’ of high feeling, you will pause, and, summoning all that is within you, you will seek to harness the mood to the deepest and most central thing in your personal being, which is your will, that is to say you will seek to harness it to what is in essence a vow. One of the tragedies of waste in human life is the waste of high and serious feeling, the failure to concentrate and canalize it, when it does come, into will and obedience.

You will not say that you do not know what all this means, because it has been stated in the vaguest generalities ; that you do not have such stirrings in the inner life. But though we have them, we do not recognize their importance ; a fine feeling, whether it be of indignation or pity or generosity or sympathy or self-condemnation, more often than not falls across our mind like a gleam of sunlight falling across a stream, adding colour and interest but not affecting the course of the stream one jot. No doubt it is exceedingly difficult sometimes to know how to translate feeling into action in any particular situation. But, true as that may be, it hardly affects the point. For to make a vow *now* is not necessarily to act externally this way or that *now*, for external action may not be possible.

The essence of the vow is to act internally. It is, so to say, to seize the feeling, and, drawing it from the superficies of the mind into the central places, to make it creative there, so that, if not now then later, it will bear fruit in action, as when Lincoln saw a negro woman being sold in the slave-market like a horse and vowed to himself that though he could do nothing then yet as opportunity arose he would help, at whatever cost, to smash that kind of thing.

Next, the vow should be made in the right company. ‘ I will pay my vows now *in the presence of all his people*.’

The solitary vow, however earnest, is the weak vow and already half-defeated. It is weak because there is no check upon the vanity and extravagance and self-reference which can creep into even the highest mood. It is weak because there is no sustaining atmosphere, no supporting environment, no continuous feeding and nourishing and educating of the whole being in the direction of its highest feelings and insights. It is weak because there is lacking the strengthening and rebuking expectancies of one’s fellows. Down to the very roots of our being, and therefore up to its highest fruits, we are social beings. I would wish to thank God daily for the high-pitched expectancies of my friends, for the way they have of insisting that I am a better person than I know myself actually to be. It is surely not something to be wholly ashamed of to say that more than once it has been the thought of my friends, the sense of having made vows in their presence, which has kept my feet from straying.

Here, clearly, is part of the *raison d’être* of the Church. Not the whole of it doubtless, but an essential part of it. To any whose deepest feelings and highest aspirations have been so stirred by Christ that they would wish with any seriousness of purpose to give themselves to His discipleship, the Christian fellowship is, for all its weakness and failure, utterly indispensable. It is hard indeed to be patient with those who profess some sort of allegiance to Christ, will indeed even come to renew their vows at Easter or at the baptism of their children, and yet sit loosely to the fellowship of His people. Usually such an attitude reveals a life from which the spirit of the vow has already departed, a mind which has lost all sense of the blasphemy of leaving this tremendous Christ at the mercy of occasional and transient feelings.

Finally, the vow must be paid to the right person. ‘ I will pay my vows *unto the Lord*.’

In any worthy vow there must be a deep and

recollected sense of God. The serious thought of God is the only finally steady thing to his purposes that a man can have. That is why decay in religion is bound sooner or later to mean decay in moral consistency and power. That is why the dictators sooner or later must fall, for nothing can hold the human spirit permanently in such absolute obedience to such all-too-human figures. And that is why the Church, for all its weakness, stands right at the strategic centre of human affairs in all their chaos and perplexity to-day. It is the only society which cuts across the false absolute of nationality and bears witness to the God whose Will stands above all nations.

Take away the thought of God, and no final necessity upon conduct remains. There remains only a disguised expediency ready to absolve itself from its contracts at the first real test, at the first call of sacrifice. The world is littered with broken vows, broken treaties. Why after all should any one keep a treaty, or a vow, if there is nothing above and beyond the natural and historical process? Should we keep it for general security's sake, in other words to save our skins? A vow kept for that reason is no longer a vow, and is no longer security. The whole virtue of a vow is in its being made to God.¹

SEPTUAGESIMA.

Take thy Share of Hardness.

'Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.'—2 Ti 2³.

It is a strange circumstance—that strong brave words like these are to be found only in times of hardship, and that they always come from the lips of some one who has suffered. An easy age is a soft age, and cannot use strong words with any sincerity. A man's courage is not ready for use unless he is using it now—using it, it may be, in some private way, for example in resisting temptations or in taking up unpleasant duties, and so mastering himself; but he must be exercising himself in courage in some real way, otherwise he has none of it.

When a man is at ease concerning his own moral life, not repelling the enemy on the threshold, but allowing base and inferior things to dim his vision of duty and of God; when as the result of such indolence, a man's own life has grown soft and yielding, he is no more at home with, but is in truth afraid of, any strong word such as bids men

endure hardness and fight the good fight, and cut off a hand or pluck out an eye for the sake of the soul's integrity, for the sake of the Kingdom of God.

We find always the hard heroic words in hard heroic days, and we find them on the lips of those who are hard pressed and suffering. For example, here. St. Paul, when he wrote these words, 'Thou therefore take thy share of the hardness like a good soldier of Jesus Christ'—was himself a prisoner in Rome. The persecution under Nero was at its height—a persecution in which the Apostle was destined to meet his death. From beneath such a shadow, and with a brave, unflinching, indomitable spirit, he hails his brother-soldier in another part of the field: 'Stand fast,' 'be brave.'

Timothy was a young man: his health poor: in temperament, as it seems, affectionate and sensitive. He was one of those who are more ready than others to give way in the midst of their work. St. Paul knows—for has he not felt the same and cried out of the darkness?—how, more than others, a highly-strung nervous man, who has no great fund of health, is liable to sudden fits of gloom when the battle seems going wrong. Therefore with all delicacy, yet with plainness of speech, he seeks to fortify the soul of Timothy against his besieging circumstances.

Those words of Paul to Timothy have an added pathos when we remember that they were among the last words of the great Apostle. And who knows but Paul, as he penned them, may have surmised that they might easily be his last!

So much regarding the circumstances in which these words were spoken. And now, to speak of the words themselves. It may seem to some of us—and there are moods when it will seem to all of us—that this command, 'take thy share of hardness,' is too strong and, one might even say, unsympathetic. We could have wished that the Apostle had added some consolation; for example, had he hinted that the hardness would soon pass and things would become easier. Or he might have gone on to explain that hardness is God's discipline of us all—thus lighting up Timothy's difficulties by showing him God's intention.

But this is just our mistake. The fact is that nothing brings such composure to the human soul in its most real hours, as to hear an unqualified command. Most of our misery arises from doubt. We are wretched usually because we are undecided. Are we at our proper work? Ought we to bear certain things which are lying heavily upon us, or should we cast them off if we can? Nothing so

¹ H. H. Farmer, *The Healing Cross*, 22.

suddenly relieves the soul, and clears its outlook, as to receive an order, a command, which it is not possible for us to avoid. When we have received a peremptory command—either through the circumstances of our life, or from some sublime inspiration within our own soul—then our course is clear, and, because the thing must be done, it is done easily. The inevitable is easily borne.

The Apostle adds nothing in the way of comfort. In the real moments of our life, when we are utterly alone because of some hard things which are meeting us, we are not helped by general explanations, but only by steadfast endurance and a tenacious faith. We read in the *Letters* of Charles Lamb, how, on that awful night, when Mary, his sister, lost her reason and killed her own mother, Charles sat through the long night alone and wrote a letter to Coleridge. It was a brave letter, written in appalling circumstances. In a few days he received a reply from Coleridge. The philosopher, after expressing his sympathy, goes on to explain the high benefit which even such a terrible providence may bring to him; how the enduring of such pains is the way in which a man tastes the Divine nature, and becomes detached from worldly things—and so forth. But Lamb replied angrily to his friend, bidding him cease from all such unreal and untimely words, and said in effect: 'I get no help from what you say about rising into the Divine nature through suffering. Indeed such language offends me and seems to me not to be fitting language for mortal men as we are. My one comfort, the one thing which consoles me is, now that the heavy blow has fallen upon me, to commit myself to God under it, to bear it and not to blaspheme.'

Although the Apostle does not in any way soften his command, nevertheless in his words, he suggests to us—and must have suggested to Timothy—two thoughts which must put an end to all complaining. 'Take your share of hardness like a good soldier of

Christ.' It is as though he had said, however others may shrink from the hardness of life, fancying that God had sent them into His world with the one idea that they should have a pleasant time here, it can never be the view of those who take their principles of living from Jesus Christ. However dimly we may see the meaning of Christ's sufferings, we do see in them this law, that only through sacrifice, only through the travail of souls, only through the surrendering of ourselves for others' sakes, does the Kingdom go forward.

And again the Apostle says, 'Take thou thy share of hardness.' It is as though he said: My son, the world is full of hardness, and people all over the earth are bearing burdens and dragging their weary feet towards some grave. Why then should you, or any one, complain of your lot and share of the general human trial? 'Take your share.' Probably it is less than your share. Is it not a shame for you, for any one, for us, to sulk and complain, and question the very goodness of God because things are not going smoothly, when at this moment, if we could hear it, there is arising from the universal heart, as from a great altar of blood and sacrifice, a wail of pain, a sigh of weariness? 'Take thy share of hardness!' It is an *appeal to our sense of honour*. For who would be content to be simply happy and at ease in a world which is groaning with its travail? Is it that Paul had it in his mind, that those who would escape the universal toil, and would live outside the universal law of suffering and service, are really cutting themselves off from the elect of God, and missing the true taste of life? They are outside the benediction of the Cross. Ever over all this earthly scene of suffering and mutual surrender, as we see the Cross of Christ, God Himself in sacrifice, God giving His benediction to it all—do we not feel that the one calamity for any of us would be to be at ease in the great enterprise? ¹

¹ J. A. Hutton, *Our Ambiguous Life*, 148.

The Relation between Travel and Conversion.

By VICTOR MONOD,¹ TRANSLATED BY HUGH THOMSON KERR, JR., PH.D., LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.

'Do travel and the uprooting of the individual from his native environment constitute one of the determining elements in religious conversion?' The phenomenon of religious conversion has always been the primary concern of those interested in the things of the spirit. Conversion has to do with a dramatic event, concentrated in time, relatively common and therefore easy to observe, and varying but little in its general character. These tempests of the soul, in which ineffable joy follows abruptly upon profound anguish, have given rise to a large body of literature. Converts like to relate their experiences at length, and psychologists have made use of their abundant documentation in different ways. Some with the aid of statistics have devoted themselves to determining 'the average age' of converts. Others have sought to describe the principal types of conversion (instantaneous or progressive, passive or active, etc.), and to show how these are usually bound up with the convert's previous theological convictions. Others have studied 'confessional conversions' and have suggested that certain psychological and even physiological temperaments could not find their full development except within an established ecclesiastical confession.

Leaving to one side these various approaches, I should like to set forth the part played by 'removal in space,' by 'transplantation to afar,' by 'travel,' in the ripening of these crises which we call religious conversions.

'Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee . . . and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed' (Gn 12¹⁻³). Such

is the significant command which we read in the forepart of the book which has given rise to both the Jewish and the Christian religions. Complete expatriation is set forth there as the primary condition of spiritual enrichment. Abraham, the father of the faithful, was essentially a traveller, a pilgrim to whom the living God appeared at the end of the pilgrimage which removed him forever from the country of his fathers (Gn 12⁷). The last stopping-place was the one where Abraham found his God. In order to receive the blessing promised him, Abraham had to renounce all the traditions of his race and run away from the serenity of his ancestral home. Thus he became the founder of a new race, that of the 'Hebrews,' that is to say—according to an interpretation cherished by speculative commentators—of a race of emigrants who have come across from the other side of the River Euphrates (the root of the word Hebrew signifying 'from the other side of'). We cannot forget, indeed, that when the Hebrew text speaks of 'Abram the Hebrew' (Gn 14¹³), the Greek of the Septuagint translates more correctly, 'Abram the traveller,' thus giving its sanction to the etymological derivation which finds in the word 'Hebrew' the name given by the original inhabitants of the land to the immigrants who had come 'from the other side of the Euphrates.' Abraham confessed in Hebron that he was a stranger and a sojourner (Gn 23⁴) and requested of the inhabitants a permanent burying-place for the use of his family. By consenting to a physical uprooting, Abraham in the land promised him gave rise to a new spiritual race as numerous as the stars of heaven.

The story of Abraham, the foreigner seeking Jehovah his God, always attracted the religious attention of his descendants and dominated their ideas. No doubt with the passing of the centuries the sons of Israel thought themselves with the same legal justification as other nations the legitimate possessors of their national territory. They participated in the pride and nationalism which political frontiers create, but when the religious sentiment spoke, they continued to confess themselves 'strangers and sojourners as were all their fathers' (Ps 39¹², cf. Ps 119¹⁹, 1 Ch 29¹⁵, Lv 25³³). It is Jehovah who is the true Lord of the land, and the descendants of Abraham the Hebrew had only a precarious and revocable title to it.

[¹ Victor Monod, distinguished pastor and theologian of the Reformed Church of France and bearing a name that stands high in the history of French Protestantism, died suddenly on 5th May 1938. His career was a varied one, and his travels brought him into touch with many peoples and many lands. Born in Algiers, he studied in Toulouse, Magdeburg, Montauban, and as student-guest at the Aberdeen Divinity Hall. Some years ago he visited America as a member of an international preaching mission. The following article, the general subject of which was of great interest to Professor Monod, appeared in the *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, May–October, 1936. The translation in the interests of clarity and brevity has been modified in minor particulars and somewhat shortened.]

This notion that the believer is uprooted from the land, an emigrant 'dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob' (He 11⁹) has inspired in point of detail a whole book of the New Testament, the Epistle to the Hebrews. I have tried in a study which appeared in 1910 (*De titulo epistolae vulgo ad Hebraeos inscriptae*) to show as others before me have done that the title of this epistle must be interpreted in a metaphorical way. The title suggests: The Epistle to the Spiritual Hebrews, to the travellers *en route* toward the Holy City. It is necessary to 'go forth without the camp' (He 13¹³) in order to go to Christ. In support of this interpretation I have given various texts from Philo and Origen.

Philo has written a whole book of religious essays to which he has given this significant title: *περί ἀποικίας, Concerning Migration*. There he comments allegorically on the journey of Abraham, and he gathers together all the incidents in the Pentateuch where men of God were exhorted to uproot and separate themselves from their kin. Thus he recalls how Abraham was separated from his own on two successive occasions (Haran and Sichem); how the same Abraham was irrevocably separated from Lot; how the great event in the life of the people of Israel is called the Exodus; how Moses told the Israelites to leave Egypt 'in haste' and without looking back; how the word for the Passover signifies migratory movement; how Moses and seventy of the elders 'separated' themselves from their travelling companions in order to ascend the mount of divine revelation, etc. All these historic events have for Philo a spiritual suggestion and symbolize the migration of those souls who abandon visible things in their journey toward invisible things. In connection with the command of Joseph that his descendants 'carry up his bones out of Egypt' (Gn 50²⁵), Philo writes: 'Joseph who was not a slave but a ruler of Egypt gloried in being a "Hebrew," that is to say, in belonging to a race habitually on the move from things of sense to things of the spirit; in point of fact, a "Hebrew" is an emigrant' (*De Migratione*, par. 4). In the same treatise Sarah is designated a 'Hebrew soul,' for she gave birth in her old age and symbolized in a body grown old the rejuvenescence and perpetual youth of the things of the spirit (*ib.* par. 25).

If Philo has singled out the journeys of Abraham and the Exodus out of Egypt as the two key-events dominating and symbolizing the spiritual life of the Hebrews, we know that the New Testament, for example in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is chiefly

concerned with the idea that the Christian must emigrate from visible to invisible things and focus his attention on the spiritual emigrants of the past (He 11). Origen seized upon this idea and particularly approved of the etymological derivation proposed by Philo. 'The word "Hebrews,"' writes Origen, 'suggests "travellers." These people are called Hebrews because they emigrated from Egypt to the land of promise, from darkness to light, from death to life' (*Homilia XIX in Numeros* 4, Migne, *Greek Fathers*, xii. 725). Origen the Christian hastens to add to the examples given by Philo the Jew examples drawn from the Gospels. So it is that, commenting on Mt 14²², Origen writes: 'Jesus separated His disciples from the multitude and constrained them to get into a ship and go before Him unto the other side until He should send the multitude away. The multitude could not cross to the other side for they were not Hebrews in the mystic sense, bearing in mind that the word Hebrew means traveller. On the other hand, the mission of the disciples of Jesus consisted in going over to the other side, in abandoning visible and physical things because they are ephemeral and in seeking rather invisible and eternal things' (*Comment. in Evang. Matt* 5, Migne, *Greek Fathers*, xiii. 914).

Thus, allegorical exegetes have not failed to point out the decisive part played by migration or the changing of place in the development of the soul. If they have not presented the facts in the same terms as modern psychologists, they have drawn attention to this truth, that an imposed journey frequently constitutes the way in which the spiritual development of the Biblical heroes takes place. Long before Bunyan, Philo wrote a 'Pilgrim's Progress' and suggested that every soul truly Hebraic never possesses a permanent home but searches for that which is to come.

But allegories and symbols might turn us away from the facts and cause us to seize upon a convenient metaphor for what I should be tempted to call a true *law* of the realm of souls.

In a great number of cases, and especially in the case of *instantaneous* or *dramatic* conversions, the moment of conversion is preceded by a journey. Let us recall briefly the most classic cases:

Saul of Tarsus was converted on the road to Damascus in the midst of a comparatively long journey which was drawing to its close. (Ac 9³ 22⁶). His whole life is typical of the travelling apostle whose visions and revelations take place in various places.

Augustine, born at Tagaste in Numidia, educated

in Carthage, took leave of his native land. He was converted in Milan and returned to Africa one or two years later in order to perform the work of priest and bishop.

Luther, converted at Wittenberg about 1513, made a journey to Rome in 1510. Even if we reject as legendary the incident of a voice which is supposed to have spoken to him as he was ascending the steps of the *Scala sancta* on his knees, it nevertheless remains that this journey was a very important event in his religious life and preceded the sense of joyous exhilaration which he experienced thereafter in Germany.

John Wesley was converted in London in 1738 as he was returning from a sojourn of two years in America. He has noted in his *Journal* the religious agony which possessed him in the midst of his long ocean voyage. Moreover, as soon as he experienced that liberating crisis of the 24th day of May, 1738, Wesley again took the traveller's staff and went to Germany in order to confirm his new convictions by a stay among the Moravians. It was after this that his apostolic labours as itinerant evangelist in England began.

These examples could be multiplied almost indefinitely. They draw our attention to the fact that travel produces an impoverishment of the normal personality, a feebleness of resistance of the psychic organization. As a foreigner one does not feel as strong as in the midst of his own environment, for the forces of social convention which tend to confine every individual to the same opinions and to the same patterns are abruptly nullified. Displacement sublimates the burden of the past and unglues the immovable label which public opinion stamps upon each of us, so that the traveller not only feels himself a new man, but he can become a new man. More exactly, the traveller feels himself becoming a child again, free to remake his personality apart from the influence of his first instructors. If statistical psychologists are correct in saying that cases of sudden conversion are observed mostly among adolescents, it is proper to add that for adults travel is especially significant in determining an artificial rejuvenescence which brings them back to the level of the adolescent or the child.

From then on the traveller, the uprooted one, will easily yield to a force which irresistibly imposes itself on him, integrating his psychic personality around a new idea.

It would be fitting now as a counter-proof to show that travel and displacement do not figure in the experiences of those who have searched un-

successfully all their lives for spiritual peace. Perhaps it will suffice to consider the Parable of the Prodigal Son who 'departed into a far country,' who wasted his paternal inheritance and flaunted his ancestral traditions, who wished to make his own way in the world. He was converted far from home and on returning he enjoyed the merrymaking, the music, and the dancing. The elder son, on the contrary, who never 'transgressed his father's commandments' and who was always with him, was devoured by jealousy and discontent. 'He would not go in' and remained hostile to the joy of his brother, the converted traveller. Has not Jesus, the master of the spiritual life, decisively pointed out here the different bent of the two lives and the two souls?

Moreover the history of religious thought abounds in appropriate examples confirming the precepts of the Parable of the Prodigal Son. Would not a study of the biographies of some of the great Christian souls who have never been able to attain a perfect integration of their psychic personalities, such as Alexandre Vinet or Amiel, would not such a study lead us to say that these great spirits remained perhaps too exclusively rooted in their native environment?

Alexandre Vinet, as we know, resisted for several years the solicitations of friends who by inviting him to settle in Paris or Montauban offered him a more extended field of activity than the 'Paedagogium' of Basle. Vinet however expressed the invincible fear of displacement which possessed him: 'I have always been rooted in Basle. . . . If you were to transplant me you would strip me of my foliage and you would be very disappointed in having on your hands nothing but a dried-up tree' (letter dated September 15, 1832. *Lettres*, i. 303).

Vinet confessed to his friends that his fears at the prospect of a distant enterprise arose from the fact that he was not fully assured of the unity and stability of his personality. If he compared himself to a fragile plant not capable of being transplanted, it was because he doubted the vitality of his roots. On the 20th of July 1833, he wrote to his friend, Charles Monnard: 'I would indeed leave this country but I feel myself unable to do so for many reasons' (*Lettres*, i. 325).

Would Vinet have experienced an unfolding of his inner being, a psychic crystallization, a 'conversion,' in a word, if an energetic friend had compelled him to take the risks of being uprooted? To such a question one can only make possible conjectures; however, is it not probable that this

scrupulous person illustrates the theory that detachment and migration are conducive in promoting strong personalities? Vinet the sedentary confessed the attraction which the story of Robinson Crusoe exerted on him. 'Each one has his own madness,' he wrote. 'Mine, or one of mine, is to reread every year Daniel Defoe's masterpiece' (Armand Vautier, *Morceaux choisis de Vinet*, Lausanne, 1897, p. 269). Vinet remarks that Robinson Crusoe was a commonplace sort of person and that it was solitude and imposed unhappiness that gave his life significance. 'It is necessary to advise those who have read *Robinson Crusoe* only in abridged editions that the true *Robinson Crusoe* contains the story of a conversion.' Thus we see that Vinet often meditated on the conversion of Robinson, the involuntary exile, but he always refused to 'Robinsonize' himself.

Amiel has judged Vinet as follows: 'More spring in his stride, more muscles undergirding his nerves, more intellectual and historical interests—that is what our Vinet, the writer who perhaps makes us think most, leaves to be desired' (*Journal intime*, November 12, 1852). There are of course in this criticism elements which could be ascribed to Amiel himself, yet the biographies of the two men differ radically. Amiel travelled extensively and traversed nearly the whole of Europe. But in spite of it all the Genevan professor does not seem to have experienced that expatriation and complete uprooting which give rise to internal renaissance. The reason for this perhaps lies in the fact that the travels of this man, exclusively interested in ideas, brought him only into lands where metaphysical speculation predominated. Has he not written of himself: 'My natural tendency is to convert everything into thought. All personal events, all particular experiences are for me texts for meditation, facts to be generalized into laws, realities to be reduced to ideas. . . . Life is but a document to be interpreted, matter to be spiritualized. Such is at least the life of the thinker' (*Journal intime*, September 9, 1880). The example of Amiel suggests that all journeys are not equally conducive in provoking the phenomena of spiritual development. What is necessary is a sense of detachment, of the breaking of traditional bonds, of coming into an existence without comparison with the past. How could an ordinary journey to Germany or Italy give rise to a revolution of a soul fenced in by a tendency to introspection and narcissism? We must not forget that if journeys do not seem to have succeeded in perturbing Amiel's ego, it is because those journeys were arbitrarily chosen and are to be measured by

the traveller. Amiel experienced to a certain extent the 'cosmopolitan life,' but he never suffered an imposed displacement such as the migration of Abraham who received a 'commandment' to leave his country and his people and knew not where he would go.

What sort of conclusions do the preceding analyses warrant? Can we and should we recommend travel and migration, to restless religious souls who have not succeeded in experiencing in their native environment a state of permanent, satisfying, psychological equilibrium?

It would seem to be so. It would be easy to give examples of instances where a deliberately planned journey, a voluntary migration, brought relief and healing to languishing and smitten souls. For example, in the life of the celebrated preacher of Brighton, F. W. Robertson, we note how a solitary sojourn in the Tyrol in 1846 following a stop in Heidelberg put an end to a profound crisis in the young pastor's faith and made possible his subsequent religious activity in England. Robertson pointed out at the beginning of his retreat in the Alps how the splendours of Nature contrasted with his gloomy soul: 'In all this glory there is a strange tumult in my bosom for which I cannot assign any cause. Grandeur makes me misanthropic, and soft beauty makes my heart beat with a misery that I cannot describe. In Retzsch's illustrations of Goethe's "Faust" there is one place where angels drop roses upon the demons who are contending for the soul of Faust. Every rose falls like molten metal, burning and blistering where it touches. It is so that loveliness does with me. It scorches when it ought to soothe' (S. A. Brooke, *Life and Letters of F. W. Robertson*, p. 93).

Little by little, however, a correspondence was established between the peace of Nature and the peace of the heart, and Robertson returned from his journey in the Tyrol reconciled with himself and with God.

Four years later the same Robertson preached a sermon on the story of the discouraged prophet Elijah whom God sent on a forty-day march to take a rest cure on Mount Horeb. Is it improbable that Robertson was influenced by his own recent travel experiences in describing Elijah's anguish?

'Jehovah,' he says, 'calmed his (Elijah's) stormy mind by the healing influences of Nature. He commanded the hurricane to sweep the sky, and the earthquake to shake the ground. He lighted up the heavens till they were one mass of fire. All this expressed and reflected Elijah's

feelings. The mode in which Nature soothes us is by finding meeter and nobler utterance for our feelings than we can find in words—by expressing and exalting them. In expression there is relief. Elijah's spirit rose with the spirit of the storm. Stern, wild defiance—strange joy—all by turns were imaged there. Observe, "God was not in the wind," nor in the fire, nor in the earthquake. It was Elijah's stormy self reflected in the moods of the tempest, and giving them their character.

Then came a calmer hour. Elijah rose in reverence—felt tenderer sensations in his bosom. He opened his heart to gentler influences, till at last out of the manifold voices of Nature there seemed to speak, not the stormy passions of the man, but the "still small voice" of the harmony and the peace of God' (F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, ii. 79f).

I do not believe it is necessary to give other examples than those of Robertson and Elijah in order to illustrate the effect of spiritual reclamation often produced by voluntary expatriation. It is sufficient to remember that the practice of 'retreats'

from the habitual social milieu has given rise to quite a body of literature, and that the solitary sojourn of Ignatius Loyola at Manresa has greatly influenced innumerable seekers of solitude.

But it is well to remember that the converted never have the feeling of going out to meet conversion. If displacement and uprooting seem to have played an essential rôle in the most famous conversions of history, let us not forget these migrations have nothing in common with voluntary retreats. Travelling converts have always insisted on the unforeseen character of their experiences. They have always shown themselves ardent defenders of that doctrine which affirms the nothingness of human efforts and the free grace of God. St. Paul, Augustine, Luther, Wesley, and why not add Calvin, who was subdued by Farel's appeal to remain in Geneva, all these have been unanimous in declaring that in the process of salvation God does everything and man does nothing. Travelling converts are also the theologians of grace!

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

THE current issue of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*¹ well maintains the reputation of the journal, both for quality and for variety. Textual criticism is represented by a detailed and searching article from the pen of W. Rudolph on the text of Lamentations. Every available source is quoted, and numerous important suggestions are made, though the author is apt to present his opinions as if they were incontrovertible facts. Probably the compressed style inevitable in textual notes is responsible for this impression; Rudolph is not so dogmatic as he appears to be. Three articles deal with higher criticism. E. Lund writes on the origin of Gn 9^{18f.}, which he ascribes to P, and not to the later strata of J. A particularly interesting feature of this article is an illuminating account of the rhetorical style of P. F. Dornseiff, a distinguished classical scholar whose contributions to Old Testament studies have become familiar through the *ZAW*, approaches the whole question

of the Pentateuch from an entirely new angle. Noting that the two erring sons of Aaron bear the same names as two of Jeroboam's sons, he argues that the narrative of Lv 10 comes from the first half of the ninth century B.C., and is one form of the protest against bull worship. Similarly, the name Zimri is borne, not only by the seven-day king of Israel, but also by the offender killed by Phineas (Nu 25). Here the protest is against mixed marriages. These and other criteria enable Dornseiff to distinguish two strata, that of the 'Tetrarchist,' and that of the Deuteronomist. The discussion is extraordinarily interesting, but the facts hardly justify the construction of a totally new critical hypothesis. The narratives mentioned may have originated in the periods assigned to them, but they have (as Dornseiff would admit) undergone considerable modification. The regnant hypothesis has always assumed that P contains much that is earlier than the age at which our documents reached their present form; even the latest strata of P are held to include primitive material which has not survived elsewhere. A smaller point, argued with equal skill by Bern. Luther, is the distinctive use of the

¹ Neue Folge, Band xv., Heft 1/2 (Töpelmann, Berlin, 1938).

terms Kāhāl and 'edāh in P and in Chronicles, the general conclusion being that the main body of the latter book is much earlier than the present form of the priestly code.

Two articles, in addition to several short notes, are concerned with exegesis. Alfred Jepsen makes an interesting contribution to the study of Joel and Micah; the former book, especially, receives careful and detailed attention, and two thirds of it are ascribed to a prophet who lived and worked in Palestine during the Exile. Julius Bewer deals with a geographical point, the location of the 'valley of passengers' mentioned in Ezk 39¹¹. He identifies it with the Wadi Fejjas, a couple of miles south of the Sea of Galilee.

If we had to estimate the comparative importance of the contributions to this number of the *ZAW*, the two first places would probably go to Hempel himself. One of his articles is a searching study of the Lachish ostraca, and it is interesting to note that, while his language about the editing of the famous letters is more guarded than that, say, of Albright, the German and American scholars are at one in their opinion. Hempel, however, like Albright, does more than criticise; he gives the text in full, with translations and a number of interesting comments, showing, in particular, how the Hebrew preserved in our Bibles is essentially the same language as that in common use at the beginning of the sixth century B.C.

Hempel's other article is more general, and illustrates his extraordinary versatility. It is a discussion of the attitude of Jesus to the Old Testament, as it may be gathered from the Synoptic Gospels. The Judaism of Christ's day regarded the Law as a substitute for the direct method of divine communication, e.g. through the prophets. While Jesus accepted the authority of Scripture as far as it went, He claimed that a new and living revelation came through Himself. He did not reject the principles of the Old Testament; He developed them. For Jewish racial exclusiveness was substituted a unique ethical standard. Prophetic and personal religion meant more to Him than the Law, and He valued His Bible in so far as it made possible the knowledge of the Father, and, while He conformed to its demands as a rule, His ultimate criteria were spiritual experience and reality. He stands nearer to the prophets than to the Law, but He never formally opposed them to one another. In Jewish monotheism, with its doctrine of a redemption whose motive power is the Love of God, Jesus found the basis of His faith.

It remains to add only that we have in this issue

also several notices of important books, and the extremely valuable list of articles in various periodicals which deal with the Old Testament.

Jeremia, der Prophet und sein Volk, by Volkmar Hertrich,¹ is an attempt to give a popular statement of the message and significance of Jeremiah. It is arranged in seven short chapters, with fairly full quotations from the Biblical text. Every chapter is headed by the statement which it is intended to develop and illustrate. The style is strongly rhetorical, an eschatological flavour is noticeable throughout, and the whole aims at showing how the prophet foreshadowed the life and death of Jesus. As a rule, the exegesis of the passages quoted is simple and natural, though it does not seem that the author has always penetrated very deeply into their meaning. The treatment accorded to Jer 20^{7a}, for instance, hardly suggests the real purport and importance of that terrible outburst. The best feature of the work is its strongly evangelical tone, but it can scarcely be regarded as a serious contribution to our knowledge of the Bible.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

PROFESSOR WESTIN of Uppsala University has made a prolonged study of Wyclif and his times, spending his summer holidays several years at the British Museum in order to have access to all the available sources of information. How extensive and minute his study of the subject has been is seen in the exhaustive bibliography of sources and literature with which the book is enriched. The result is this very able and thoroughly documented study of the great English reformer before the Reformation.² The book does not profess to be a minutely detailed biography of Wyclif, but, as the title indicates, an investigation of his ideas of reform. The urgent need of a reformation of the Church in England, as well as elsewhere, is seen in the description of the state of the Church given by the author and especially in the constant references to it in the quotations from Wyclif's writings. On all the debatable points connected with dates and other subjects Dr. Westin exercises an independent judgment. The author has a very high opinion of Wyclif's ability, learning, earnestness, courage, and persistence in contending for a root and branch reformation of the Church, and of his clear,

¹ Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; RM.1.80.

² Gunnar Westin, *John Wyclif och hans reformidéer* (Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri, Uppsala).

evangelical views on theology and religion. He considers that the failure of the Wyclifite reformation was in part due to the fact that the ruling classes in England were not yet ready for a thoroughgoing work of reformation, but also because it suffered from certain defects from the religious standpoint. It was, he considers, too negative, too onesidedly bound up with a reform programme touching the Church's external relations, which, however important in themselves, were not adequate for a religious movement. In spite of his Augustinian doctrine of grace and predestination and of his zealous plea for the sole authority of the

Bible, Wyclif's conception of faith and justification was not sufficiently deep. His fight with the monks led him into a fight with the contemplative life. He disliked the mystics. The central point of his whole doctrine of salvation was *gratia predestinationis*, not *gratia justificationis*. In spite of its spiritualistic traits Wyclif's point of view was predominantly intellectual and moralist. But still through Huss and Bohemia there flowed a mighty influence from Oxford and Lutterworth into the great reformation. This treatise on Wyclif is well worthy of careful study.

JOHN A. BAIN.

Belfast.

Contributions and Comments.

Matthew v. 21, 22.

21. Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις Οὐ φονεύσεις·
ὃς δ' ἂν φονεύσῃ, ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει
(i.e. 'legal proceedings'—A. H. M'Neile).

22^a. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι

πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἔνοχος ἔσται
τῇ κρίσει (i.e. 'judgment at God's hands,' as
a civil court cannot take cognisance of angry
thoughts or feelings—A. H. M'Neile).

22^b. ὃς δ' ἂν εἶπῃ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ Ῥακά, ἔνοχος
ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ (Syr. ܠܠܥܠܡܝܬܐ, τῇ συναγωγῇ).

22^c. ὃς δ' ἂν εἶπῃ Μωρέ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γένναν
τοῦ πυρός.

The chief difficulties in these notoriously difficult verses are :

(1) That the apparently ascending scale of guiltiness with corresponding varieties of liability does not sound like the manner of Jesus.

(2) That, in any case, the point of the distinction between Ῥακά and Μωρέ is not clear.

(3) That the interpretation of κρίσις in 21 and 22^a is uncertain.

The solution proposed by Peters and Bacon (referred to by A. H. M'Neile) and by A. J. Grieve (in Peake's *Commentary*), viz. that Μωρέ is equivalent to Ῥακά and that 22^b is a second quotation from what was said τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, and 22^c is Jesus' reply (parallel to 22^a), seems precarious because it

depends on a non-existent ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω to introduce 22^c.

In an article in *Z.N.T.W.* (1919, pp. 91-94) Konrad Köhler points out that Neander had previously suggested (what is clearly likely enough) that Μωρέ is a gloss on Ῥακά, and that the words ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ are an interpolation. (Incidentally, Köhler further mentions the possibility of ἡ γέννα and τὸ πῦρ also being alternatives which have been erroneously combined.) Köhler goes on to support the contention that ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ συνεδρίῳ is an interpolation by patristic quotations; but what he does not do is to give a satisfactory explanation of the origin of the interpolation.

May it be that τῷ συνεδρίῳ, no less than Μωρέ, is a gloss? The words τῇ κρίσει are sufficiently ambiguous to divide commentators still; and I would suggest that a glossator wrote τῷ συνεδρίῳ (or τῇ συναγωγῇ, if the Syriac versions are right) in the margin to explain to a non-judaistic public that by κρίσις was meant a Jewish court (whether local or supreme). The original text would then have run :

Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις Οὐ φονεύσεις·

ὃς δ' ἂν φονεύσῃ ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει.

ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι

πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἔνοχος ἔσται
τῇ κρίσει·

ὃς δ' ἂν εἶπῃ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ Ῥακά, ἔνοχος ἔσται
εἰς τὴν γένναν τοῦ πυρός.

As soon, then, as *Μωρέ* and *τῷ συνεδρίῳ* (or *τῇ συναγωγῇ*) had crept into the text, it is easy to imagine a subsequent scribe trying to mend matters by repeating *ἐνοχος ἔσται* and *ὁς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ* in such a way as to produce a semblance of an ascending scale of guiltiness with corresponding penalties.

If the theory of a twofold gloss—*Μωρέ* for *Ῥακά* and *τῷ συνεδρίῳ* (or *τῇ συναγωγῇ*) for (the 2nd) *κρίσει*—is correct, it disposes of difficulties (2) and (3), and lessens difficulty (1), for it only leaves two degrees in the scale of guiltiness. The sense will, on this showing, be: 'You have heard that it was said to them of old, Thou shalt not murder; and

whoever murders shall be liable to legal proceedings. But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother has that degree of guilt; and as for a person who shows contempt for his brother, he shall be liable to lose his very soul.'

I am not satisfied with the last clause, and the truth may yet prove to be that it represents some Rabbinic saying to which Jesus' reply has been lost; but at all events it seems possible that *τῷ συνεδρίῳ* (or *τῇ συναγωγῇ*) may be, like *Μωρέ*, a gloss, and the number of perplexing clauses may be thus reduced.

C. F. D. MOULE.

Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

Entre Nous.

Bishop Guy Bullen.

Writing from the Southern Sudan in December, 1936, Bishop Bullen said: 'My thoughts travel backward—and forward. The backward ones full of thanks to God for many mercies and loving-kindness. As always on these occasions I thank Him for my parents and my home. There's something very satisfying about a phrase like "the God of my fathers."'

Guy Bullen came of East Anglian stock on both sides. His father was a man to whom the rule of life was duty. All his spare time he spent in the service of Leyton Church where he was a churchwarden. From his mother he inherited his marked interest in people. Her spiritual influence over him was even greater than was his father's. 'Religion was, it seems, for John Bullen a way of life; for his wife, life itself.'

Bullen went almost straight from school to France. He gained the Military Cross. 'This officer set a very fine example to his men.' He had already been much influenced by the Keswick Movement. At the end of the War, he went to Queen's and then took a full theological course at Ridley Hall. In the Michaelmas term of 1923, he felt a call to the mission field. The Rev. G. T. Manley, then C.M.S. Secretary for Africa, came to Cambridge and appealed for a band of men who would offer themselves for a specific piece of service in the Hausa States of West Africa. Bullen

offered himself and was accepted—and went out as one of the first of the Hausa Band. A friend, says about this time: 'I have never forgotten the impression . . . of one who was not going to pretend, for the glory of the thing, that he wanted to go. He didn't, and he said so. But I knew that he would inevitably go.'

The biography of Bishop Bullen, which has just been published by the Highway Press (5s. net), has five chapters, each contributed by a different friend. His Nigerian years, 1926–1935, are described by the Rev. M. A. C. Warren, the Vicar of Holy Trinity, Cambridge; the last two years, which deal with his time in the Southern Sudan as the Assistant Bishop—he died suddenly as the result of an aeroplane crash—are described by Martin W. Parr, O.B.E., of the Sudan Administrative Service. There is no doubt that Bishop Bullen's greatest work was done in Nigeria. When he went out he was at once faced with difficult decisions on policy. Previously the Mission Settlement had been in a compound in the centre of the city and this was regarded as a strategic position which should not be given up. Bullen felt, however, and the future proved him right, that they should move out where they would have more space. A new position was found, schools were started and hospitals, and most important of all, a beautiful church built in native style. There is an interesting Appendix dealing with the design and

construction of the church. Three characteristics, Mr. Warren says Guy Bullen had, which made him eminently suitable for this difficult task of breaking with past traditions: 'a certain sweet reasonableness, a perfect courtesy, and an inflexible integrity.'

In a biography written by several hands, as this is, there is the advantage that each writes about that part of the life which he himself knows most intimately. Full and accurate details are therefore likely. But the picture of the man himself is likely to suffer. It has so suffered here. At the same time Bullen stands out as one who had achieved a rare poise between this world and the unseen world: 'that meant that he could enjoy without fear of criticism, with complete unself-consciousness, all the good things which we are given in this life richly to enjoy.' . . . 'Someone once described him to me as a "worldly bishop" ; I can understand that. He was worldly, if the parables of the Synoptic Gospels are worldly ; for Guy's life was a parable.' In his diary, near the end of his life, Bishop Bullen wrote: 'The test of religion, the final test of religion, is not religiousness but love: not what I have done, not what I have believed, not what I have achieved, but how I have discharged the common charities of life.'

P. T. Forsyth.

The Independent Press Ltd. have just issued a cheap edition of P. T. Forsyth's *The Work of Christ*, first published in 1910. There is a delightful new Foreword by Principal J. S. Whale. He ends in this way: 'But the marrow of a truly modern divinity is here for all who will feed on it. We who are ministers of the word of God in these difficult and dangerous days can hardly fail to hear in this book, written twenty-eight years ago, what the Spirit is saying to the Churches.' The volume also contains a short memoir by P. T. Forsyth's daughter, Jessie Forsyth Andrews. How strange it is that no biography appeared after Peter Forsyth's death in '21. Perhaps the reason was partly his own wish, 'I hope no one will ever write a dreary official full-dress biography of me.' Mrs. Andrews' memoir is short, but all the romance of the story is here. There was a family weekly wage of eleven shillings. The father and mother scraped and saved incessantly for Peter's education. Long afterwards, in apology for ignoring his own daughter's birthday, he wrote: 'Forgive a poor boy who never had any birthdays or any presents.'

When one remembers the early privations, it is extraordinary how many-sided Forsyth was.

London, his daughter says, was 'like wine to him,' and he was in touch with many sides of its life—politics, literature, art, music, and the theatre. (Taboo to so many Victorian saints.) As Principal of Hackney College, he raised its entire academic standard. But it was Forsyth who said: 'Gentlemen, you are *not* here to graduate in the University of London. You may or may not do that. You are here to graduate in Christ and His ministry.'

The Independent Press are to be congratulated on the attractive appearance of the volume—which contains also a list of all Forsyth's works. The price is 4s. 6d. net.

What is a Religious Film?

In the *Church Times* for 9th December, Mr. Andrew Buchanan, film director and author of a number of books on film production, sets himself to answer this question. 'We are inclined to confuse religion with religious formality, and, for that reason, I feel that before we can develop the religious film, we need to understand what it is, or what it should be.'

'A religious tableau, whether on the screen or the stage, is usually dramatic, solemn, and, in varying ways, inspiring, but invariably it succeeds in isolating religion—making of it a thing apart from everyday life—a thing of rare beauty received by the public with silent respect and awe, and a minimum of understanding. What I can best describe as "visible religion" perpetuates the fallacy that the spiritual factor has no real connexion with anything outside the Church—that it would be as out of place in everyday business as a stained-glass window in a Tube station.' . . .

'But again I ask, What is a religious film? On the commercial screen I have seen several productions which have exerted a spiritual influence, made more powerful because the audience was unconscious of its presence. *Mr. Deeds Goes to Town* was definitely a religious film, but it was also a great box-office success. *Green Pastures* was a queer and distinctly religious picture, but it won approval. Laughton's rendering of Biblical passages in Rembrandt was quite the most beautiful cameo I can remember for a long time. Yet, in the strict sense of the word, none of the films described can be classified as religious, except perhaps *Green Pastures*. . . .

'Far be it from me to indict the cinema. It does its job efficiently, and provides an escape for millions. Merely do I sometimes feel that it would be better (though not for the cinema) if there was

less reason to escape—from life, which, in the end, always captures us. The aim, therefore, should be to increase the proportion of films which exert a desirable influence, without decreasing entertainment value. The introduction of religion does not infer the elimination of laughter.

‘It means, as I see it, that an invisible quality shall permeate the entertainment offered to the public, to remind it of the nearness of those things which are unseen, and for the need of a greater appreciation of them. A quality which shall constantly reveal to people that materialism is not enough. That the strongest light in the world is not generated in a power station. That a mind needs making up as well as a face. That we should not concentrate only upon the things which we can touch and grasp.’

The Message.

Seldom do two outstanding volumes of sermons appear in the same month. But this month we have one by Professor Farmer, and another by representative Scottish preachers, edited by the Rev. D. P. Thomson.

Professor Farmer does not need our commendation—enough that he has published a volume. It will find a ready public, for he deals with the problems of to-day, and he writes in the language of to-day, and he is known to be one of our deepest thinkers. In his Introduction, Professor Farmer says that the message to men to-day should fulfil four conditions. First, it must have a cosmic note: ‘the note, that is to say, of the Christian fellowship being called of God to be the organ of His purpose in relation to the whole process of history.’ Then again, the Message must be so presented that it has a strongly agnostic note running through it. A message which confesses to no nescience will seem, as Job’s comforters seemed to Job, too confident to be true. Again, the Message must be so presented that the note of austerity is clearly heard: ‘The note of a call to adventure, to danger, to heroic and costing enterprise, must be heard, if the Gospel is to fit the modern scene and to seem any other than a mere twittering of birds over a volcano.’ Finally, the Message can only be to the individual. No person can dedicate another person.

The title is *The Healing Cross* (Nisbet; 6s. net).

The second volume is *The Professor as Preacher* (Clarke; 5s. net). The seventeen contributors have in common that each has a Chair in one of the Scottish Universities or Colleges. Most of the names are very well known, and here again we

need do little more than list some of them: Dr. John Baillie, Dr. D. S. Cairns, Dr. Wm. Fulton, Dr. G. D. Henderson, Dr. D. Lamont, Dr. W. M. Macgregor, Dr. John Macleod, Dr. W. D. Niven, Dr. J. G. Riddell among others. All except three contributors, unless we mistake, are Church of Scotland. The Baptist Church is represented by Principal Holms Coats, the United Original Secession Church by Dr. Francis Davidson, and the Free Church by the Rev. P. W. Miller.

Dr. Manson’s sermon on Obedience in the Christian life has been given in an abridged form in *The Christian Year* this month, as has also one of Dr. Farmer’s.

Prayers for Children.

Miss P. L. Garlick has written and arranged a companion volume to the ‘Prayers for Boys and Girls.’ The title is *All Our Friends*, and it is intended for children under eight. It is published by the Highway Press in attractive yellow paper covers for 3d. This is how the pamphlet begins:

GOOD MORNING

‘Good morning,’ says the friendly sun,
And through my window peeps;
‘Good morning,’ sings a friendly bird
With chirruping cheep-cheep-cheeps;
‘Good morning,’ barks my friendly dog,
As pleased as pleased can be;
‘Good morning,’ calls a friendly voice
In the garden next to me.

A new day is just beginning. God is saying Good morning. He is my loving Father, and I am His child. He wants me to be a happy, friendly person all through this day.

For Whitsuntide Miss Garlick makes use of Christina Rossetti’s lines:

Who has seen the wind?
Neither you nor I;
But when the trees bow down their heads
The wind is passing by.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.